Appendix A-6: Community Advisory Group Terms of Reference

Lawrence Park Neighbourhood Investigation of Basement Flooding (Area 20) & Road Improvement Study Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

Draft TERMS OF REFERENCE Community Advisory Group

Background

As in many established neighbourhoods in Toronto, the infrastructure – roads, storm and sanitary sewers – in the Lawrence Park neighbourhood needs improvement. Traffic and pedestrian safety issues exist and road drainage systems are unable to convey stormwater effectively. Historically, part of the Lawrence Park neighbourhood has also experienced issues with basement flooding during heavy rainfalls. Basement Flooding Area 20, within the Lawrence Park neighbourhood is one of 34 areas in Toronto included in the "Basement Flooding Work Plan", approved by City Council to address basement flooding across the City.

The City of Toronto has initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) study to address issues relating to deteriorating road conditions, traffic, pedestrian safety, drainage problems and basement flooding in the Lawrence Park neighbourhood. Measures that improve stormwater quality and reduce storm runoff will also be identified during the EA.

A Community Advisory Group (CAG) will be established by the City to enable Lawrence Park neighbourhood residents, businesses and local institutions to provide advice and comments to City staff and their consultant team during the EA study.

Purpose and Mandate

The purpose of the CAG is to provide an ongoing forum for residents, businesses, community groups and institutions to provide feedback, guidance and advice to the City and its consultant team during the EA. The CAG will be a non-political advisory body.

The mandate of the CAG is to liaise with City staff and consultant team during the EA to discuss and provide feedback on matters within the scope of the EA. Examples include:

- Issues relating to infrastructure (roads, storm and sanitary sewers);
- Alternative solutions to address these infrastructure issues; and
- Preferred solutions for final recommendations

Membership

Members will include residents and representatives of neighbourhood businesses, community groups and institutions, as well as the local Councillor or their designate. It is anticipated that the CAG will be comprised of approximately 20 members split evenly between stakeholder residents, businesses and local institutions.

Members of the CAG must abide by these Terms of Reference.

Meetings and Term

It is anticipated that the CAG will meet approximately 2-3 times during the EA, generally in advance of broader public consultation meetings. Meetings will be held during the evening at a suitable location in the study area and meeting dates will be confirmed in consultation with CAG members.

The CAG will be established in the Spring of 2013 and members will participate on the CAG for the duration of the EA (expected completed date for the EA is Spring 2014).

Roles and Responsibilities

Members of the CAG will:

- Agree to these Terms of Reference;
- Participate at 2-3 meeting of the CAG (meetings will be 2 to 2.5 hours in duration);
- Consider any matters, issues or information referred to them by the City staff and consultant team and provide feedback, advice and recommendations as requested;
- Ensure that meeting outcomes are accurately documented in the meeting records/summaries; and
- Liaise with the organizations/institutions they represent regarding the information and matters discussed by the CAG, and bring forward issues, recommendations or advice from their organizations.

City staff and their consultant team will:

- Provide accurate, understandable information to the CAG;
- Ensure that appropriate project team representatives (or other resource people) are present for discussions on specific issues or components of the project;
- Listen carefully to the feedback and ideas of CAG members and endeavour to ensure that issues and concerns are resolved in a timely manner; and
- Identify who will be responsible for actions or measures in response to CAG input and feedback.

Operating Procedure

The CAG is non-political advisory body to City staff and their consultant team and as such, is not responsible for decisions made by the City, its consultants or City Council. All participants in the CAG will work to identify common ground, as well as areas where opinions may differ. All feedback will be documented in the CAG meeting summaries/records, along with a list of follow up actions and measures to be taken by the City or its consultant team in response to CAG discussions or recommendations.

Facilitation

Facilitation services for the CAG will be provided by an independent facilitator – Lura Consulting. These services will include facilitation of CAG meetings and development of meeting agendas, in consultation with City staff, their consultant team and CAG members. The role of the facilitator will be to ensure that meeting agendas are adhered to, and that all CAG members have the opportunity to be heard and participate in the development of feedback, advice and recommendations.

City staff will provide secretariat services for the CAG, including:

- Organization and coordination of CAG meetings;
- Distribution of meeting notices, agendas and meeting records/summaries; and
- Preparation of meeting records/summaries for CAG review and approval.

Appendix A-7: Community Advisory Group Meeting #1 Summary



Lawrence Park Neighbourhood Investigation of Basement Flooding (Area 20) & Road Improvement Study Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

Meeting #1, Toronto French School November 5, 2013. 6:00 p.m.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Attendees:

Residents/Community Organizations: Katherine Kowal-Haggart Mona Bechai Nabil Bechai, Mildenhall Residents Association Gord Mickovski, Toronto French School Peggy Judge Patrick Mars **Rick lus** James Chervl Dan Guttman Lynn Francis, Mildenhall Pedestrian Safety Group Lisa Donahue John Gill. Lawrence Park Residents Association Barb Stinson Ann McVittie JD McVittie Norma Russell

Wendy Walgate Pamela Vallance John Carnella Otto Mittelstaedt Donald E Smith Geof Clarkson Lou Fernandes, Sunnybrook Hospital

Emma Best, Councillor Jaye Robinson's office

<u>Project Team</u> Jackie Kennedy, Project Manager Man Kit Koo, Toronto Water Mark Berkovitz, Transportation Services Julia Murnaghan, Parks, Forestry & Recreation Kate Kusiak, Public Consultation Dave Maunder, Aquafor Beech Dave Dilks, Lura Consulting

Note: a few residents attended as observers

Welcome and Agenda Review

Dave D introduced himself and explained the purpose of the meeting. The role of the Community Advisory Group (CAG) is to preview the materials prior to each public meeting and provide feedback to the project team. Dave's role is neutral and he is here to facilitate the process.

A package of materials was handed to each person containing the agenda for the meeting, as well as materials for the upcoming public meeting. The CAG Terms of Reference (TOR) was emailed in the summer as residents indicated their interest to participate on the CAG.

Everyone introduced themselves, what street they live on and their affiliation, if any.

Dave D asked that all members consider all materials as draft and to not take them home because they will be revised based on the feedback received. All the final materials will be published online after the public meeting on November 19th.

Community Advisory Group – Mandate and Terms of Reference

Dave D summarized the CAG Terms of Reference. It is an ongoing forum for community members to give guidance to the city during this study. The CAG is a non-political body. CAG members are here to give advice, and this group is not required to achieve consensus or make decisions.

It is anticipated that the CAG will convene about 2 or 3 times, prior to public meetings. **Dave** asked for concerns or feedback on the Terms of Reference.

- **Dan** would like to receive 3 or 4 week advance notice of the CAG meeting dates. **Kate** – will try to get 3 weeks notice for the next CAG meeting.
- Peggy would prefer meetings on Mondays to not interfere with responsibilities at home.
 Kate will try to get Monday CAG meeting dates, depending on venue availability.
- Pam Understand that we are not making decisions tonight. Have decisions already been made by others?
 Jackie No decisions have been made. At this stage in the process we are presenting conceptual solutions that may work for this area. The next meeting we will present feasible solutions. From these, recommended solutions will be developed. From a technical perspective, we will have a list of projects that we believe will work, they will be reviewed by you for comments, before they get approved as capital projects by City Council.

Kate handed out sign-in sheets for participants to sign indicating they agree to conform with the TOR.

Presentation – Dave Maunder, Aquafor Beech

Dave M began the presentation of the display boards. There are 5 basic issues identified because the area is dealing with a variety of issues.

Slide 4 – This study is following a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process, which is required, by the province, to follow a specific format. The format is to identify the problem, define conditions, present a long list of alternatives, consider a short list of solutions and come to a conclusion on which projects should be implemented.

Slide 5 – This is a summary of geotechnical findings. The study area is not homogeneous with different existing conditions in various parts of the neighbourhood. For example, St Ives that runs north south is in the middle of the study area, to the west is former City of Toronto and has different standards compared to the ones in former North York (east of St Ives).

Slide 7 – A number of field work activities were carried out. We heard that roads were in terrible condition. Approximately 109 bore holes were made in the study area to determine the conditions of the road. Streets in red are ones that need to be reconstructed - at full depth. About 40% of the roads in the study area need full depth reconstruction and 20-40 % need some kind of new asphalt.

Slide 8 – Homes west of St Ives were built in 1940s or 1930s and some streets have one sewer, where combined stormwater and sewage could overflow into the lake. Over time the city upgraded the system and some of the water goes into a separate storm sewer system, but it is still 80-90 years old. On a road like Rochester, the road is great, but the sewer is not. In areas east of St Ives, the purple streets indicate that there is no sanitary sewer system in place. Most likely, something will need to be done on the roads in purple.

Otto – regarding the lines or sewers in blue, do they go under homes by Pinedale?
 Dave M - no, they are located in the road way, but there may be some easements. I would need to look at the details. It is called a trunk combined sewer and collects water from a large area, it's about 1.5 metre in diameter.
 Peggy - there probably isn't space there between the homes.
 Dave M – we will need to look at maps.

Slide 9 – **Dave M** continued with the slides. This slide shows where flooding has occurred, but not for specific homes, just the general areas. Red areas reported flooding more than 4 times. Some areas in other parts of Toronto have more severe and frequent flooding, but this area still experiences flooding.

Slide 10 – We looked at the age and type of trees in the area. There are 2700 trees, which are rated from high to low in terms of preservation priority. If reconstruction is needed and if the trees are close to road, they may or may not survive the construction work. At the next meeting, the different alternatives will be presented, and will include an indication of likely impacts on trees by the construction.

Slide 11 – The starting point for road widths is 8.5 metres wide. On roads like Bayview Wood, the road widths are sometimes less than 6 metres wide.

- Barb asked about Braeside. Why was resurfacing done on Mildenhall which stopped at this street? Why not go a bit further because there are still holes.
 Mark Staff have done some maintenance work, which cost about 5% of what it will cost to reconstruct the road. The work is to address problems on high traffic areas. Some additional patching and maintenance work may occur as we go through this study.
 Barb The patching does not stay in for more than 2 months and there's no real traffic on Mildenhall north of Lawrence.
 Dave M This study will provide a long term strategy, so that the area can improve over the long term. At the same time, there are still short term needs to address, as this study goes on.
- Lynn –Is there engineering capability to do work within the existing road width, or are there choices available?
 Dave M Will present that and speak to it in a later slide.
 Jackie Would like to clarify that road widths less than 6 metres will be looked at to make them wider. The city standard is to have an 8.5 metre wide road and when construction work is planned, and the City tries to meet that standard.

- **Rick** Clarify that Mildenhall paving is a quick temporary fix. **Mark** – Yes it is, and all factors will be considered in the study.
- Peggy Does the road need to be 8.5 metres wide?
 Dave M It is a starting point. We are here to get your feedback and will hopefully present this cohesively in later slides.

Slide 12 - Dave M continued with the slides. There are 6 or 7 locations in the area where sight lines may be blocked and are not to city standards. This is likely not of primary importance to people here. We want to identify these issues and look at what should be done from a safety perspective.

 John G - At Dawlish, when turning left onto Bayview, a church has a sign and row of trees that block southbound traffic which comes very fast.
 Dave M - noted.

Slide 14 – **Dave M** continued with the slides. In February, there was a comprehensive survey issued to residents and infiltration of traffic through the study area was identified through the survey responses received. Infiltration is traffic going through the area, not traffic that starts within the area or ends in the area. A license plate survey was conducted in the morning and afternoon. Where you see less than 11%, that means less than 90% of people either started or stopped inside that area. Where you see the red, that means upward of 30% of people were not local to the area. Mildenhall and St Leonards are being used for drivers to go through those streets. We want to show the level of infiltration in this slide.

- Patrick The traffic is going to The French School, due to volume, or they are going north. There is no other place for people to go. There is huge volume of traffic going down Rothemere in the morning.
 Dave M the original intent of the traffic infiltration study is not to look in that area north.
- Norma Why is the line green on half a block of Rochester? Due to parking on Glendon campus, students park here in this area and walk to campus. When the parking authority is called, it still happens. We can't access our driveways. Residential parking allows for parking for up to 3 hours. When people have guests over, conflicts over parking are common.
- John G On Dawlish on Sundays, there are issues with staff going to Sunnybrook, workers and visitors.
 Dave M This study did not look at the final destination of the through-traffic. We studied through-traffic in this neighbourhood.
- Geof Did you look at traffic on Dinnick, because people use it to bypass Mt Pleasant and Lawrence, especially during rush hour. I'm worried about students on the way to school.
 Dave M - There was no focus on one given area.
- **Don** The intersection of Mt Pleasant and Lawrence is a problem. There is no obvious answer to it. People will go out of their way to avoid it. Lots of people in the morning are going to The French School in order to avoid that intersection.

Dave M - That would factor into what you see in this diagram. We are looking at local roads, however, we aren't looking at arterials like Lawrence or Bayview. But if there is an impact that is brought up, we can look at other things done in the area.

- Rick You haven't taken into account the whole section, the area opposite side of the French School, at Wanless Crescent.
 Dave M We need to move forward and look at what we can do. We need to figure out what can be done.
- Otto Could there be a map similar to flooding map showing accidents in the neighbourhood?
 Dave M That map was presented at the first Public Information Centre. The map showed the 6 year collision history. It can be found on the project webpage on the City's website.
- Peggy The section of St Leonards Ave is green, then red, so where are the cars coming from.
 Dave M They may be going up Lewes. If 2 or 4 cars came out in one area, compared to another area where 4 or 5 came out, then the difference shown looks larger, but it you average it out, it's 30%. The focus is to show the primary affected areas.
- **Nabil** There are cars going through Mildenhall and surrounding streets, north of Lawrence, I recommend that more information to show on the area north of Lawrence.
- Geof There are a lot of institutions in the area, Crescent School, The French School, Glendon, Sunnybrook. They all impact this area, and we haven't heard about them.
 Dave M They are on upcoming slides. This slide only speaks to the local streets with respect to traffic infiltration.

Slide 16 – **Dave M** continued with the slides. This slide identifies key areas that people will go to, listed in the legend. This map also shows brown and blue lines that show sidewalks on both side and one side. Sidewalks are in the former City of Toronto and there are none in the former North York.

• Otto – On Dawlish, into the dead-end part, there is only a sidewalk on one side. Dave M - Noted.

Slide 18 – **Dave M** continued with the slides. This slide provides the city perspective on flooding issues in the area. Some homes have downspouts that go directly into the ground and into the sewer. They should be disconnected. Residents could also put in rain barrels, xeriscape their yards to conserve water. You can redirect water to your garden or slow it down on the way to the sewer. If the sewer isn't big enough, a larger one can be installed. Other options include storage tanks or directing the water into a pond to capture it before it goes into a stream.

Slide 19 – Included in this study is the improvement of water quality. Some examples in the Greater Toronto Area are shown on Slide #20. In 1970 and 1980s, a big sewer was put in. Unfortunately, the trouble is that the water was dirty and then it eroded the streams into where it discharged. The idea now is to treat and hold back some of this water. In Hoggs Hollow, a pipe was installed that was permeable and some of the water then goes into the ground. On Prince Edward Drive, which has a rural standard cross section – there is no curb – the water goes into

the pipe and infiltrates into the ground. On a street in Mississauga is a bio-retention unit, which looks like a garden. On July 8 storm, this took about 1/3 of the 80 mm of water that rained down.

• **Pam** - If you have a sidewalk next to the curb, you won't get the same drainage. It's not as good environmentally to have a sidewalk at the edge of the street, because then the water won't be able to drain.

• John G - From the city perspective, it's great putting water into the ground, from our perspective (Lawrence Park Residents Association), we look at safety issues. In Pam's example, if it were a choice between pedestrians who can walk safely, would safety be trumped by the option to have water entering the ground. Are there operating principles the city brings like pedestrian safety trumps trees, for example?

Dave D - Later in Dave M's presentation will be evaluation criteria, and the next round of consultation we will get feedback on that criteria similar to the point you are raising. John G - There is opinion, and then there is expertise. Expertise from civil engineers is needed in order to know what the right infrastructure should be. Surely there should be expertise at the city level to say what infrastructure is right.

Dave M – In this case, these options are not mutually exclusive, they can be compatible, these components can be built in. For safety, there will be more information on the next slide.

• **Peggy** – It isn't necessarily "A" vs "B" - there are trade-offs that are made and there may be a best way to clear water away, but it will be a cost. It's not severe, but it is inconvenient.

Dave D - The study is all about trade-offs that are associated with the various options. **Jackie** - These questions are about policy and we are trying to put together different pieces of the puzzle to address different needs. At this point we are trying to capture them and marry them with policies the city has, to address the different issues, like sewer flow modelling, road widths, stormwater drainage and quality. We do need input from the public on the evaluation criteria, that is why an Environmental Assessment is done before the design work.

Pam – Is there an option to reduce the number of outside users of the streets? Is that being looked at? Will one of the solutions deter outside users?
 Norma – As a precaution, we may need to be careful what you wish for, because you can be locked in the neighbourhood as well.
 Dave M - Some alternatives will look at reducing infiltration.

Slide 22 – **Dave M** continued with the slides. This is the core of presentation. We will show about 10 roads with existing and conceptual illustrations that incorporate different options, such as widening roads to city standards, which is the starting point from the city's perspective. Other conceptual illustrations will incorporate drainage features to reduce flooding and improve storm water quality, and sidewalks due to existing policies. It will also consider environmental impacts. There are 4 building blocks that are intertwined, and we want to consider them and move forward in the best way possible.

Slide 32 – The City owned Right-of-Way (ROW) is typically 20 metres. The starting point is an 8.5 metre wide road, concrete curb, and a 1.7 m sidewalk on one or both sides of road. The standard width of 8.5 metres is for space to accommodate emergency service vehicles. Fire trucks need 6 metres to come through. The 8.5 metre width also considers safety from

pedestrian and vehicle conflicts, safe two-way traffic, winter maintenance and snow windrows. Within the 8.5 metres, there are a variety of issues that can occur, so the starting point is 8.5 metres to meet these 7 listed considerations.

- **Resident** If you live beside a road that is 6 metres wide and has no sidewalks, are you saying it should be 8.5 metres wide with an additional 2 metres for a sidewalk on one side, for a total of 10.5 metres? Will that additional area come off of people's front lawns?
- **Dave M** The additional area is within the City Owned right-of-way.
- Lynn Are cyclists and bike lanes on local roads being considered? Dave M - They are not being considered. Bike lanes are only considered on arterial roads (Lawrence, Mt Pleasant, Bayview) and these are not being considered in this study, except for Blythwood.
- Otto What do you mean by a starting point? Is that the minimum for each street? Dave M - We would like to see the public's response initially, and if we find out that further widening has a significant impact, we will need to consider other options. If a road is less than 8.5 metres, you will also need to consider street parking.
 Otto - If a solution is proposed and a majority of people on that street oppose it, will it still go ahead?
 Dave M - That will be part of the evaluation process. It would not definitively be the case. This is a starting point, we need to present this information to get feedback. If we look at narrower roads, we would have to consider other impacts.
- John G Will the construction work from this study last 80-100 years? By then, everyone in this room will be dead. And right now, we are dealing with issues from the last 100 years, which were decided that long ago. So the decisions made in this project will have long term impacts way into the future and we need to keep this in mind. Even if everyone on the street says right now they don't want this, who at the city will say, this is something that should go in for the good of the next 3 generations of residents.
- Barb Wome people do want sidewalks, but in our area, we don't. We only want the street resurfaced. If Hoggs Hollow can be done without sidewalks, why can't ours?
 Dave M This is just the start of the process, we will receive and respect public opinion. We will need to see where the final recommendations are, some requirements may be flexible and others not.
- Mona The first page of the handout shows the limits of the study area, up to Braeside. But on these traffic maps and road widths, the study area has been truncated.
 Dave M - Yes. The traffic study was limited to core of the study area (south of Lawrence, east of Mt Pleasant, west of Bayview, north of Blythwood), because north of core area, to do a traffic assessment, we would have to look at an area much bigger that these boundaries of the study area.
- Barb Can we have something done for the area north of Lawrence?
 Rick The area is on the study map.
 Mona Will the conclusions be applied to the entire area or the truncated area?
 Dave M The entire area.

Mona – So a part of the study area is being studied, but solutions will be applied to the entire area?

Jackie – The traffic slides on page 14 and 15, these should be the only maps where the area is truncated.

Nabil – However, the traffic still goes up here, and the institutions generate most of the traffic. It's not right.

Dave D - We have noted that issue.

Dave M – We want to present conceptual ideas and get your feedback on these slides. I tried to pick representative areas to show you concepts that could be applied elsewhere in the area. Not every road in the study area is shown.

Slide 23 – From the existing photo of St Leonards, we've illustrated what it would look like if it was 8.5 metres with a sidewalk and then listed the implications. We've also shown the city ROW and indicated if the tree that may or may not remain if the road was widened to 8.5 metres.

- Otto Will the centre line of the road be the same of the ROW? Will the sidewalk intrude on one side of the ROW compared to the other side?
 Dave M For example, if there were mature trees on one side, then the sidewalk would likely go on the other side.
- Resident It would be helpful if you could indicate which direction you are looking, for example, looking east down St Leonards.
 Dave D Noted.
 Dave M We had some concerns with being too specific and listing the street names.

Jackie - We just wanted to show an example, a concept, to say that a street *like* St Leonards could look something like this concept.

- **Dave M** If you live west of St Ives, the roads meet the 4 main criteria, road width, sidewalk, what will likely be done there is simple repaving.
- **Resident** We would like to maintain the heritage of the area on St Aubyns, slide 24, to keep the character of the ditch. But trees may be in jeopardy.
- **Otto** Is that the rural standard, to retain the ditches, and the roads that retain the curb and gutter are the urban standard?
- **Peggy** Without passing judgement on sidewalks, I think that sidewalks should be on both sides, so that from a child's perspective, you can cross at safe places. Also if there is a sidewalk on just one side, then people will still walk on the road.
- John G We surveyed Lawrence Park 5 years ago. About 2/3 people wanted sidewalks. What constitutes the public? This information was passed onto you.
 Norma I didn't get a survey.
 Pam Has mentioned sidewalks to people, and she heard that 3 years ago they believe they thought no sidewalks were preferred.
 Dave M This is an Environmental Assessment and so, there will be opportunity to comment in this study. We will take this information right now these are only initial concepts. Future ones will also be presented.

Jackie - These concepts will also be in the questionnaire, which will be online and at the Public Information Centre. We are asking for feedback on what you like and your concerns on each concept.

- John C Questions about traffic. First Question: In the analysis, was speed looked at? Dave M - Speed is not covered in the Environmental Assessment process, but we can still consider it.
 John C – Thinking about the future after construction work is done to smooth the roads, vehicle speed may increase if roads are smoother. Will the City look into safety methods to counter this increase in speed?
 Dave M – Any type of traffic calming is not done through Environmental Assessment process. It is part of the Councillor-led process.
- **Nabil** Can you add description of what the picture shows. Add in brief descriptions from questionnaires.
- Lynn The crescents are safety issues, compared to straight roads. The crescents have unique challenges and opportunities.
 Dave M We have included Lewes and St Aubyns to show these characteristics.
 Lynn At the St Ives intersections it's difficult for pedestrians and cars to use.
 Dave D We have noted that.

Dave M continued with the presentation and briefly described the elements that were added and the different variations in the conceptual drawings on this set of slides.

- Mildenhall: we have shown sidewalks on both sides because it is not a local road, it is a collector. It will show sidewalks on both sides due to the traffic on that road and the number of pedestrians.
- Buckingham: is conceptual in nature. We will try to preserve trees and can bump the road out to save them.
- Norma Which street would be comparable to the North York section of Rochester? Dave M – It may not be different from Cheltenham or St Leonards. We have tried to show a variation on different rural cross sections. Jackie – These are concepts, so an example on St Aubyns could be applied to another street. Each street will be identified at the next public meeting. Otto – Is it each street? Jackie – It may be each street or each type of street that will come out at the next stages of the study. Dave M – We are trying to present ideas and different types of concepts, and then based on your feedback, we can refine and look at a fewer number of options. Dave D – Noted. We need to emphasise that these drawings are conceptual and not final.
- Jim If all the options are presented, is there the Hoggs Hollow option for this project?
 Dave M Specifically, which part of Hoggs Hollow are you referring to?
 Jim The narrower roadways, with the curbs without sidewalks to keep the rural look of the area. If that isn't an option, I want to know why.

Dave M – We are presenting concepts tonight as a starting point, we just want to show concepts to generate ideas and feedback.

Norma - In all fairness, you said that you could be creative. But these drawings show very disciplined concepts.

- Patrick I didn't get this notice, how will you get people to get to the public meeting? Dave M – A sample notice is in the handout package.
 Kate – An advertisement will be issued in the City Centre Mirror on November 7 and 14. That newspaper has a circulation of all postal codes within M4N. The main method to notify impacted residents is by delivering a notice in Canada Post unaddressed admail. If your home has a sign to <u>not</u> receive junk mail, the mail delivery person will not deliver the notice. We cannot control what Canada Post staff do. Lastly, we collect emails from people when they attend the public meetings, so that we can notify them of future meetings. If there is another method that will efficiently notify residents, please let me know.
- John G This group was supposed to be managed. It has excluded a vast majority of areas in the study area.
- **Jim** On Braeside in 2005, we requested road improvements and were denied by the city because you need to have curbs, sidewalks, and a petition. We decided no curbs and sidewalks. This summer Mildenhall got paved. And our previous request was denied. We want to ask the Councillor about preferential treatment of different roads in the neighbourhood.
- **Nabil** The questionnaire shouldn't identify the streets on the concept slides, because I will only look at options only on my street and focus on that.
- **Dave D** That is something to consider and we struggled with how this is presented. We wil consider it.
- Dan If you showed the different street widths, then we could look at concepts that are analogous to the concepts presented.
 Dave D The questionnaire also asked about the long list of alternatives, and we know that people don't have expertise, but opinions. Due to the Environmental Assessment study process, we must present a long list.
- Nabil In the questionnaire, create a table of contents that show the different elements in the concepts.
 Dave D At the Public Information Centre, there will be a presentation, display boards and small group discussion.
- Peggy At the end of Public Information Centre meeting in April, there was conversation about creative sidewalks, which include things like paths. If you need to walk on both sides of the street, maybe designated pathway with gardens and stones could be presented - it could provide safe passage that maintains the feel of the neighbourhood.

Norma – Agrees that there needs to be a middle ground. The minority views shouldn't be disenfranchised. Otherwise you will have backlash.

• Lisa – To clarify, all this feedback is being considered, but at the end of the day, the decisions of what gets built and not, is made by the city.

Dave M – We will try to take the input, then present 3 alternatives and will select preferred alternatives for each street or street type.
Lisa – Is that married with city engineering background?
Dave M – Yes, the consulting firm has those expertise backgrounds.
Dave D – Will it be city council to decide?
Dave M – An Environmental Assessment process is supposed to be independent of the City Council or political process.
Jackie - City Council's involvement is by approval of the funding for all capital projects.

John G – So a patchwork could be the result - 60% roads with sidewalks and the other 40% without.
 Dave M – The overall solution needs to have synergy to it. If you look at the parts with

Dave M - The overall solution needs to have synergy to it. If you look at the parts with the worst existing conditions, they will likely be done, and the ultimate product needs to be cohesive.

- Otto What is the width of Hoggs Hollow.
 Dave M 7.2 metres.
 Otto I live where I do because its rural character, but I also understand that safety is an issue.
- **Katherine** The illustrations show the suburban concrete sidewalk. I would like to see other kinds of options where rural character is maintained. Can those be presented?
- Lynn The heritage of the neighbourhood should be married with pedestrian and vehicle infrastructure. The concrete sidewalks don't meet the heritage of this neighbourhood.
 Dave M The team will discuss the type of sidewalks to be recommended.
 Peggy With the path, it can go on the other side of the road and could preserve the heritage.

Note: due to time constraints the next steps in the project were summarized and members were reminded to leave their notes and comments with staff before they leave. Members will be contacted for the CAG Meeting #2.

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Appendix A-8: Community Advisory Group Meeting #2 Summary



Lawrence Park Neighbourhood Investigation of Basement Flooding (Area 20) & Road Improvement Study Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

Meeting #2 – Toronto French School Monday, June 16, 2014. 6:00 p.m.

Attendees:

Residents/Community Organizations: Katherine Kowal-Haggart John Carnella James Cheryk John Gill, Lawrence Park Residents Association (LPRA) Wendy Walgate Norma Russell Dick MacDonnell Lisa Donahue Peggy Judge Lou Fernandes, Sunnybrook Hospital <u>Project Team:</u> Jackie Kennedy, Project Manager Man Kit Koo, Toronto Water David Kellershohn, Toronto Water Jawaid Choudhary, Transportation Services Eric Stadnyk, Parks, Forestry & Recreation Tracy Manolakakis, Public Consultation Dave Maunder, Aquafor Beech Dave Dilks, Lura Consulting

<u>Councillor's Office:</u> Councillor Jaye Robinson Mike Varey Allison Buchan-Terrell

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 pm

1. Agenda Review and Introductions

Dave D welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. He noted that the intended focus of tonight's meeting would be on road width and basement flooding. The next meeting will be late 2014 in advance of the third Public Information Centre (PIC).

Councillor Jaye Robinson addressed the group and said she would be sitting in on part of the meeting but also needed to be at three other meetings so could not stay for the whole meeting. She wanted to attend this meeting because she knows there has been some tension within the community on the issue of sidewalks, curbs and connectivity and she wanted to hear what people are saying. She also wanted to explain why there has been a lull in activity. She had intervened and done so in consultation with John Gill, from LPRA. She wanted to ensure that there was information about the

basement flooding management plan before any further meetings were held. This information has now come in, and so staff coordinated this meeting. She appreciates everyone attending during a busy time. She has been working to put in an interim measure: "shaving and paving" some roads in the study area. This has met with mixed reviews. Some people are worried it will increase speeding in the neighbourhood while others are happy to have their roads repaired.

Clarifications:

• **Jawaid** noted that the recent road improvements are an interim measure intended to last 5-7 years, until the longer term solutions can be completed. Grinding the road is a more intensive process.

Comments from CAG:

- The work done on Dawlish in 2013 had a grinder involved in the process. No grinder was observed with the work done this year.
- The improvements are a benefit, particularly for seniors and pedestrians.
- There is some concern about the traffic volume and some expectation that this may continue with further road improvements.

Actions:

- **Councillor Robinson** will look into how work was done on Dawlish in 2013, compared with the work done this year on Mildenhall.
- **Councillor Robinson** indicated that staff could be asked to look at some treatments to reduce speeding (along with enforcing speed limits)
- **Post meeting clarification:** implementation of traffic calming measures follows a process that is separate from the on-going EA.

2. Approval of Minutes from CAG Meeting #1 – Dave Dilks, Lura Consulting

Dave D asked for any comments about the Minutes from CAG Meeting #1, which had been circulated after the last CAG meeting and were also available at this meeting. The only correction was the spelling of James Cheryk's name.

The minutes were approved.

3. Project Update – Jackie Kennedy, City of Toronto

The feedback received from the public at the last PIC in November 2013 confirmed the issues of top concern were basement flooding, pedestrian safety and urban green space. The feedback also highlighted concerns about the proposed evaluation criteria that was presented. Because of this, the team went back to the drawing board to see if they could compromise on some of the standards that had been presented at the PIC. It was noted that this caused a change in the schedule that had been previously communicated to this group. It was noted that the EA process can be iterative depending on the feedback received.

The content to be reviewed tonight in the presentation shows the changes that are being proposed and the basement flooding recommended solutions. It was explained that the basement flooding solutions are the underpinning of what will form the recommended solutions for the neighbourhood. It was noted that basement flooding solutions are being presented tonight, however surface flooding solutions depend on the road cross section recommendations. The team doesn't yet have the recommended solutions for the roads and surface flooding.

Comment from CAG:

• There is concern that new developments are approved without adequate consideration for the water table. It was asked if this study considers the water table.

Response provided by Dave Maunder:

• Yes, groundwater was assessed through about 150 boreholes. The water table gets closer to the surface as you approach the river (the water table slopes towards the river). East of Bayview it is about 2 metres below the ground. It also varies over the course of the year. There are one or two new homes that have very deep basements that require their sump pump to run constantly.

4. Presentation: Study Findings and Recommendations to Date – Dave Maunder, Aquafor Beech

The content of the presentation is attached as Appendix I to these minutes. The following reflects discussion during and after the presentation.

It was noted that the presentation would address the new approach with respect to preferred road widths, and would focus on recommendations for basement flooding. Public feedback from the fall of 2013 indicated that the issues of highest concern are basement flooding, pedestrian safety and impact to urban green space.

4.1. Road Widths / Roadway Cross Sections (slide 5)

Since the last PIC, as a result of public input, the study team has reconsidered putting forward a preferred road width of 8.5m with 1 or 2 sidewalks for local roads. 7.2m road widths are now under consideration, along with 8.5m widths. This is the same width as was recommended in the Hogg's Hollow Environmental Assessment. It was noted that with the revised long list of alternatives, Mildenhall is the only street that will be considered to have two sidewalks, it is the only street classed as a Collector.

Comment from CAG - there were some varying opinions from the CAG members as summarized in the below notes:

- Having the same width as Hoggs Hollow for consideration is appreciated. Another point made was that Hoggs Hollow doesn't have an elementary school within the area.
- There was some concern about narrower road widths bringing traffic to a standstill during emergencies. There was recognition that emergencies require temporary impact to traffic.
- Concern that one sidewalk will not be adequate and will not provide connectivity or sufficient safety for children.
- The planning should be for the long term, and should put safety above all else.
- Safety could require different things on different streets.
- There was a comment made that the municipal governments should make the decision on behalf of
 everyone without making concessions to individual property owners at the expense of the broader
 public.

Clarifications from City and Consultant:

• Noted that not all of the roads in the study area will necessarily receive a recommended road width that is the same. It is possible for the set of recommendations to present some streets with 7.2m width and others with an 8.5m width; some streets to have no sidewalks and others include

sidewalks

- The approach is to plan for the long term and not come back and do it again soon.
- As an EA this is a technical process that requires taking the various considerations into account. These will include pedestrian safety. An is a prescriptive public engagement process to address the various issues of concern.

4.2. Pedestrian Linkages (slide 6)

It was noted that the evaluation criteria will include a scoring for the creation of pedestrian linkages to key destination in the neighbourhood.

4.3. Basement Flooding Recommended Solutions (slide 7 - 8)

Dave M noted that there is a fair amount of flooding in the area. An overview was given of typical flood controls including source controls, conveyance controls, and end-of-pipe solutions. This neighbourhood originally had combined storm and sanitary sewers, but there has been separation of most of these sewers, though two streets in the neighbourhood still have combined sewers.

Comment from CAG:

• Insurance company would not provide insurance without the installation of a backwater valve. Ten years ago, the City did not want people to install these because it moves the problem to another home.

Clarifications from City:

- Products have improved within the last ten years and are more reliable now.
- There is concern about how the backflow valve is installed because if it is not done correctly, then it can cause problems for the homeowner. If its installed in the wrong place it can push water from your own property back up.
- Undertaking a number of measures simultaneously provides the maximum protection.
- It is now mandated under the Ontario Building Code that new homes must have backwater valves. The city provides a rebate for the installation of a backwater valve. <u>Tracy Manolakakis will</u> provide the materials to the CAG members about the Basement Flooding rebate program which includes guideline for hiring a licensed contractor.
- When the project work is complete, during storm events that are within the design objectives, there should be no more flooding from public land or facilities. There may still be problems arising between private properties.

4.4. Mandatory Downspout Disconnection (slide 9)

In this area the current rate of downspout disconnection in this neighbourhood is 41%. The Mandatory Downspout Disconnection Bylaw means that many of the homes in this neighbourhood are now required to disconnect their downspouts.

Comment from CAG:

- Why are only 41% of downspouts disconnected if it has been mandatory?
- Downspouts flowing onto driveways are not hazardous in the summer so they should be disconnected for the summer months and reconnected for the winter when flooding isn't usually a problem anyway.

Clarifications from City:

• The City is currently informing the public, not enforcing. Furthermore, the by-law allows for exemptions to be considered under certain conditions. An exemption requires an application to be filed.

4.5. Basement Flooding Recommended Solutions (slide 10 - 17)

Slides with alternative solutions and recommended solutions for the two areas (the partially separated sewer area and the fully separated sewer areas) in the study area were presented.

Comment from CAG:

- Will the recommended solution be effective for the flooding north of Lawrence?
- Dawlish during a regular rainfall looks like a river.

Clarifications from Dave Maunder:

- The flooding north of Lawrence is not from public property. This solution is proposed because of basement flooding south of Lawrence. East of Bayview, flooding is largely due to undersized sewers. He stressed the importance of disconnecting downspouts because those that are still connected go into a sanitary sewer which do not have the capacity for stormwater.
- It took four hours for water to be able to clear through the system during the July 8, 2013 storm event. It was about a 25 or 50 year storm. Since the storm in August 2005, the new standard for new storm sewers is that the return rate is for a 100 year storm. This is much higher than what was planned for in the past. The volume during storm events has increased significantly and the City is having to put in wider pipes.

4.6. Basement Flooding Recommended Solutions (slide 18-19)

Some alternative treatments are being considered to allow infiltration of some water into the ground. Urban vs Rural cross-sections affect which methods can be used. Where roads are reconstructed, systems are now put in place to retain stormwater and allow infiltration. Some pictures of examples from other parts of the City and GTA were presented. It was noted that any system is designed to be able to immediately take in all the water from a two year storm. Beyond a two year storm, there will be water running along the road until it finds a way into the system. With a rural section it has to go in a ditch for a two year storm, but any system is designed to ensure the road is dry with a two-year storm.

Comment from CAG:

- Maintaining these systems (wear and tear, and build up in swales) and the changes that tend to come from contractors doing work on the private property is a concern.
- There is concern about taking portions of front yards to be used as ditches.
- New development should be taken into account when designing the solutions.
- There is confusion about what is "urban" and what is "rural". A picture of how the street is affected would be helpful. For example, when discussing Dawlish, there should be a board showing what Dawlish will look like under different
- Hoggs Hollow terrain is a disaster for water management and there they requested a low maintenance system

Clarifications from the City:

- There is an effort to move toward a possible rural aesthetic on the surface that includes an urban sewer system below. More conversations are needed to determine what is possible and how they can be maintained.
- Ditches relate to surface drainage. People need an understanding of how their actions on their own properties contribute to these issues.
- It was noted that maps need to improve to ensure the public can easily understand them.
- It was clarified that all the streets have sewers, location of sanitary sewers were indicated, as well
 as those that need to be replaced. The ones without colouring indicates that the sewers are
 satisfactory and do not need replacement.

- New development has been taken into account in the recommended solutions.
- The solutions presented at the meeting are only for Basement Flooding, additional recommendations for Surface Flooding may require additional work in the sewer system. This content will be presented at the next meeting, along with the road cross sections.
- In the rural cross-section there is still a sewer, but it is underneath the ditches. City staff prioritize where to put in bigger pipes to deal with bigger storms based on where it is necessary because it is costly to put them in.
- It was clarified that the back up on Vallyanna Drive is from the sanitary sewer (not the storm).

Councillor Robinson responded to a **CAG member's** question of how Hoggs Hollow is performing, that staff is quite pleased with that system because it all held up fairly well during the July 8, 2013 storm. The banks of the river didn't destabilize and there was not much basement flooding in the area.

4.7. Study Process Discussion

Comment from CAG:

- How will conclusions be arrived at? Who makes the final decisions? How much weight does this group versus the public have in making the decision?
- Receiving recommended options ahead of time would enable CAG members to drum up interest in the neighbourhood for subsequent CAG meetings.
- When will it be known whether a recommendation for a particular street is urban or rural.

Clarifications from the City and Consultant:

- The project team has provided recommendations (Slides 13 and 17) for the partially separated and fully separated sewer areas respectively.
- This is an advisory group. The project team recommends a solution to the Ministry of Environment after making any revisions to it as a result of the public process. The public is able to file an objection with the Ministry of Environment (MOE). The public will have 30 days to comment on the recommendation and during that time can issue an objection by submitting a Part II Order. The MOE will determine whether to accept the recommendation or whether the City must go back and redo some of the process.
- The recommendations for road cross sections will be presented at the next meeting.
- Recommendations will be based on the solutions that score the highest with the various identified criteria.

5. Questions and Feedback

The project team had set out the following discussion question to the CAG: What feedback do you have on 1) the revised alternatives for road width/roadway cross sections; 2) recommended solutions to address basement flooding? Since basement flooding had been discussed quite a lot during the presentation, the focus was primarily on the revised alternatives for road width and cross-sections.

Note: Questions (Q) and Comments (C) were asked by CAG members, and Answers (A) were made by staff or consultants.

Q1: If a road is rural now, will it stay rural?

A1: For each street a rural and an urban cross-section will be presented, and with different street widths. Up to 8 alternatives will be considered for each street. Those will be presented, along with one recommended solution, for comment at the next PIC.

Q2: Is it possible to have a combination of urban and rural cross-sections and drainage systems? A2: Yes. Traditional urban sections and rural sections were shown.

Q3: People fill in deep swales.

A3: These are shallower swales. They can mow them.

C1: The rural cross section looks nice when it is first built but people will park in shallow swales.

Q4: In the coming meeting you need to have pictures of alternatives for every single road, so that people know exactly what the options are for their own streets. Don't make people try to imagine what their street might look like. Please send this to us even before the CAG meeting so that we can think about it beforehand, and talk to our neighbours about it.

A4: We showed pictures of specific streets at an earlier meeting and we were asked by the committee not to show them because people got upset. At that time it was more conceptual. It seems clear that more people want specific recommendations now.

C2: Is there controversy about curbs? Rounded ones are OK. People will still park on them.

C3: After a comment was made about removing tree(s) if they are impacted by the road work, the following comments about rate of tree loss were mentioned:

- Several people objected to this idea.
- An acceptable rate of loss for a few is zero.
- We have lost so many trees already, with the recent rain and ice storms.
- If they're going to die anyway, design the road properly and replace them with new trees.
- Nobody said anything about replacement. If they will be replaced, then I'm listening.
- You can't take out too many mature trees and think you're going to be able to replace them with little twigs and maintain what you had.

Q5: This would be less disruptive to the community if the city just built it and six months later everyone would get over it.

A5: This is where we're at with the process now, to allow transparency.

Q6: When you widen a road, consider taking from properties on both side of the road otherwise people on one side of the road get hammered.

A6: That is part of detailed design. Those decisions come later. What we use for our assumptions now is that we would widen from the centre line of the road. At a maximum it could widen to 14.5m if the road goes to 8.5m with one sidewalk on it. We need people to be clear on that and know what it could involve.

Q7: Can we have a creative solution to sidewalks that give sidewalks without an urban feeling? For example, a meandering path (not concrete) on the far side of the trees to separate pedestrians from traffic, save some trees and keep a more rural character. It could still have flower gardens on both sides.

A7: That would likely be part of detailed design. However, this may have impacts on accessibility. It is not City standard.

C4: I can see that it might be aesthetic but it could cause accessibility problems.

Q8: There was a question about where the zero/one sidewalks come from? Why not two? A8: The reason is because of the impact on urban green space in making two sidewalks.

Q9: Will there be a pedestrian linkage plan to show how it all comes together? A9: Yes. The evaluation will show where high priority is given to pedestrian routing, for example linking neighbourhoods to schools.

Q10: You should get input from us about how people get to and from destinations. We are very familiar with it. If you come and observe it, you may not get the full picture depending when you come A10: At a minimum we will bring that out at the next PIC.

Q11: What about accessibility and the policy governing it?

A11: I believe that policy governs how we build a sidewalk, not if we build one.

Q12: Isn't a lack of sidewalks inaccessible? There should be separate meeting on roads and sidewalks

A12: In the fall we're going to present a variety of options for road widths and sidewalks.

C5: CAG members made the following points about road widths and the need for sidewalks:

- Different roads are different. A small dead end street doesn't need a sidewalk. I don't want to lose my property to make an unnecessary sidewalk.
- The point is it's not your property.
- Different streets have different needs. For example, it's probably OK for Dawlish to have one sidewalk, but at Mildenhall and Bayview, there should probably be two.
- The project team is in a difficult position trying to please everyone. They're doing a great job but it is tough. As taxpayers we should be involved in these decisions.

Project team made the following responses to the points mentioned in the paragraph above:

- We will be presenting the alternatives and recommended solutions. There is a process that has to be followed. We have to be transparent. We cannot provide recommended solutions without explaining how we arrived at them.
- Everyone has the right to object to our final recommendations. The CAG is a sounding board to get to good recommended solutions.
- The evaluation criteria (environmental, technical, social, economic and other factors) will help show how we arrived at recommended solutions. The CAG will get to preview that before the next PIC.

Q13: Can we have enough time to preview them?

A13: We have to have realistic time frames to allow staff an appropriate turnaround time.

Q14: Will you have designations for each street at the next CAG meeting? A14: Yes, we will present each street with its evaluation.

Q15: Will there be a map showing how each street changes in each way?

A15: Yes, we will provide visuals to help people understand what is being proposed and the impacts of the alternatives.

6. Wrap Up and Next Meetings

Councillor Robinson said that there is a blackout period for meetings in the run up to the election from August 1 to October 27. She doesn't want there to be rumours and friction in the neighbourhood because there cannot be any meetings during that time. **Jackie** said that the next public meeting will present the recommended solutions. **Tracy** added that the CAG will meet again before that PIC, in order to discuss issues of road width and sidewalks.

- A CAG member asked if CAG meetings are permitted during the local election black out period. Councillor Robinson replied yes, but she cannot attend them. A member of her staff can attend.
- A CAG member pointed out that the CAG is not very representative of the neighbourhood.
 Councillor Robinson agreed that there is only some representation of different streets in the neighbourhood in the CAG. Tracy added that some members said they were going to be here, but didn't. A CAG member suggested that staff can ask why people didn't attend and reconsider the 6pm time period.

In conclusion, **Tracy** summarized that the project team has to come back to the table with better visual presentations and descriptions of the work being proposed and to be evaluated.

The meeting adjourned at 8:18 pm.

Appendix A-9: Community Advisory Group Meeting #3 Summary

M TORONTO

Lawrence Park Neighbourhood Investigation of Basement Flooding (Area 20) & Road Improvement Study Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

Meeting #3 – Lawrence Park Community Church Thursday, April 23, 2015 7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

Attendees:

Residents: Gordon Homer Lynn Francis James Cheryk John Gill, Lawrence Park Residents Association (LPRA) Don Smith Peggy Judge Norma Russell Dick MacDonnell Project Team (staff, consultants): Jackie Kennedy, Project Manager Man Kit Koo, Toronto Water Justin Bak, Transportation Services Mark Berkovitz, Transportation Services Shawn Dillon, Transportation Services Eric Stadnyk, Parks, Forestry & Recreation Harold Moffat, Parks, Forestry & Recreation Tracy Manolakakis, Public Consultation Dave Maunder, Aquafor Beech Dave Dilks, Lura Consulting

<u>Councillor's Office:</u> Councillor Jaye Robinson Kim Farr

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 pm

1. Proposed Format for Upcoming Public Information Centre #3

Question/Comment	Project Team Response
There are different meeting dates for different streets?	Yes.
Mildenhall Road relates to many streets, but it's nowhere near the other streets of the group it's in. It relates more to Buckingham, Cheltenham, and that group.	All the same information will be presented at all the PICs, and people are free to choose whichever one they want to attend. We've broken it up by area just to try to focus the discussion on each night.
It is likely to come up at every meeting. It might make sense to put Mildenhall in all of the groups.	We can clarify the wording to make sure people understand that they can attend any PIC and Mildenhall will be addressed at every meeting.
I think you did a great job on setting up the PIC events. It looks good.	Thank you.

Where is St. Leonard's Crescent on the notice?	If there is no recommendation for a particular street, then no day is allocated. But people are welcome to attend anyway.
Even if there is no recommendation for a street, maybe you should still list these streets on the notice.	On the flyer, it does mention that if the street isn't listed, there is no recommendation for that street, but people can still attend.
Maybe put the other streets in brackets.	It could be tricky to fit all the additional streets into the flyer.
The events should be promoted to the community – door-to-door.	It will be sent out by Canada Post. People are welcome to distribute it further. We will e-mail it out to the CAG and to people on the project mailing list, and people are free to distribute it further.

2. Questions and Feedback on Presentation

Discussion Questions

- Do you have questions about the presentation?
- What advice do you have to improve the clarity of the presentation material in preparation for the upcoming Public Information Centres?

Question/Comment	Project Team Response
Clarification question: Between alternatives 4 and 5, the real difference is impact on trees?	Yes.
So the assumption you've made is that although you have identified tree preservation and pedestrian safety as the priorities, ultimately you're prioritizing trees over pedestrian safety?	There are a number of factors, and different priority ratings. The intent for the public meeting is not to go into the details. The public will be given a 2 page overview as to how the options are scored. There will be an opportunity to comment. We can work with you to discuss why we scored the alternatives as we did. In some cases it did not result in the least number of trees being lost, but in a moderate number being lost, particularly when a sidewalk is put in.
There is a lot of data being presented, and I'm concerned that putting it forward in one push can give rise to problems that don't exist. People may not be reading everything that is there. People should do their homework and read it beforehand.	We're hoping that by us putting things on the website beforehand, people will do that.

Prioritizing trees over people's lives is a problem. Pedestrian safety should be way above trees. If you look at Leaside, and you ask which is more important, a tree or a little girl's life, you'd get a straightforward answer. If there are recommendations for no sidewalk on a street, you need to have a very good reason for this. The City's website says that there is a policy to try to put sidewalks on every street, and the main reason given is pedestrian safety and inter-connectedness. Just one criterion is 500m to schools, parks, churches, and that would cover the whole area with sidewalks. I don't think you have heard this community's concern and prioritization of sidewalks and inter- connectedness. Basement flooding is not a priority, it is a given. But on pedestrian safety, I don't know why this area is treated differently than other areas of the City. You have an opportunity to fix a problem here. You get so many elderly people calling 311 asking for pedestrian safety. If there is that much "pink" on your map, then you've wasted your time.	
I was hoping for at least sidewalks on both sides of Mildenhall. I agree about sidewalk connectedness. There is a lot of pedestrian traffic into TFS. There are no sidewalks for areas north of TFS, but there are kids walking in both directions to Bedford Park school.	We did rate the trees as high, medium and low priority. About 90-95% of the trees were deemed to be healthy and viable. If a tree was in poor condition it was considered to be low priority.
There is so much information here that the clarity of the message is being obscured. There is a risk of people getting caught up in the "weeds". We have a very divided community and you should explain your evaluation as clearly as possible so people understand how you make your decisions.	
I don't think the terms "urban" and "rural" cross- sections mean anything to people.	
Did you consider the age of the tree? An old tree may not live much longer. We love our trees dearly, but I would rather lose my old, dying tree to get a sidewalk.	
Did you take into account species? i.e. Maple trees don't live as long as tamaracks, which are a unique species.	Species were identified but not taken into account in the evaluation.
People are desperate for sidewalks and want their kids to walk and bike.	
Are people going to be comfortable with big trees being chopped down for a sidewalk?	
Councillor: Why does Mildenhall need sidewalks on both sides?	Comment from CAG member: There are people walking both sides. It is quite busy and the traffic isn't predictable. There is a lot of bike traffic along there too. Part of pedestrian safety is not having to cross streets.

I liked the presentation – it was informative and detailed. If you want to stop information overload, do a section and then do a Q&A, then another section and then another Q&A, etc., and then summarize and allow an overall Q&A.	
I'm all for sidewalks for safety, but we went through this process, and I can tell you that north of Lawrence there is very little pedestrian traffic. We went around our neighbourhood and did a survey and sent a petition to the City saying we didn't want sidewalks there.	Councillor: We have had many meetings with TFS. They have a new, interim headmaster who is more willing to meet and be flexible, but it does take time to phase in measures to correct things.
The issue is not with the roads, but how the traffic is directed for the Toronto French School. People go crazy about TFS, and you should be prepared for that. You need to go back in history and say what the problem was, and what has been done to deal with it, and how you consult with the Toronto French School.	
At the last meeting, there was a lot of confusion with lots of alternatives. I think you've done an excellent job in clearing things up. You might be able to cut down the presentation even more: if there are no rural cross- sections being recommended, then take them out – it is just confusing. There are three points to work on: roads and repaving and road-width; sidewalks, and drainage (which is the most important and should be at the top). The description and layout is great and I have no complaints.	
You have rural in the process as it was one of the alternatives being considered.	There are a few roads with ditches on them. Some of the roads are neither rural nor urban, such as St. Leonards and Dawlish. There was a request in the process to have rural considered.
The only difference is that you have a ditch?	Yes. The Toronto area is all urban. In 1960, they had what we consider a rural-type field, which was a soft shoulder and ditch.
The pictures are misleading. Don't put the grass median in.	
The people I talk to don't want more sidewalks on the local roads. These people are not organized, but that is their preference. On the local roads, the local residents should have a strong say on it.	
(Another SAG member asked this SAG member: What is the objection to sidewalks?)	
It changes the character of the streets they're on. There is not a lot of traffic, so they don't have the same safety issues.	

I second those who have said that the picture is misleading. I haven't wrapped my head around basement flooding. You talk about downspout disconnection, but grading and landscaping is done on private property. I understand the need for downspout disconnection but a lot of the basement flooding comes from landscaping and grading. When a new neighbour comes in, they often change the grading. On Rochester, most of my neighbours don't favour sidewalks.	On basement flooding, there is a general policy in the City to disconnect downspouts. It is very important on the east side of St. Ives. There are no storm sewers there – the stormwater is going straight to the sanitary sewers and that is causing flooding . It takes only 15 downspouts to overload those and cause flooding. Councillor: Landscaping and grading is really an issue for the Planning Department. I would be glad to help you with that. When the developers come in, they are supposed to ensure that the grading is done properly.
With respect to the sanitary sewers, I presume you are taking into account the huge population increase on Bayview that is feeding that. I have a friend on Dawlish who lived there for years and never had flooding and is now getting it. With all the additional toilets flushing it must be overloading it.	
The problem is not the additional toilets. There used to be a little lake there and a "cork" - an underground parking garage – was put there. That is what is causing the flooding in that area.	
How did you conclude where the pedestrian linkages should go? The routes on Slide 15 – these are not the routes that I see people take. The people who live on the east end of Dawlish going to school, walk straight down Dawlish and down Fidelia. That is the preferred route, not zigzag.	We looked at where the parks and existing sidewalks, and connections to existing facilities.
I have mentioned before the issue of creating paths through the right-of-way, to go around the trees, in order to make a compromise and keep the trees and also provide the sidewalk. Can you not make the sidewalk go around the tree, which preserves the tree, gives an impression of a narrower road which reduces speeds, and maintains the character of the street?	My general answer is that there is too high a density of trees, which would be very circuitous. There is not a City mechanism to build those kinds of paths. Installation of it would still have impacts. We don't have the standards support these. The issue of building a non-standard concrete sidewalk is that it increases the maintenance needed for the sidewalk. Asphalt sidewalks would increase the maintenance requirements.
There are three parks in this area: Wanless, Cheltenham and Stratford and there are no sidewalks around these at all. That is where the kids are going and that is where there should be sidewalks.	
I'm puzzled by people who talk about the ambience of the area when there are houses all over the place being knocked down and replaced with monster homes.	

Opinion and aesthetic does not trump people's lives. We are not going to agree on aesthetic – that is a matter of opinion. We are now in an urban environment and we are part of the City with lots of cars coming through. There are many more cars coming through now. We are not doing anything to improve safety. I want the City to do its job.	
It might be that sometimes horrible accidents happen regardless of what you do and whether you have sidewalks or not. It is questionable whether sidewalks would solve the problem.	
I think it is about what kind of neighbourhood you want to have: we want a neighbourhood where it is more liveable and the streets are alive with pedestrians and people can connect to the schools and parks. There doesn't have to be a sidewalk on every street but you should prioritize pedestrian connectivity. We have a beautiful neighbourhood but people are afraid to walk in it.	
The City needs to listen to everyone, including tax- payers who don't want sidewalks. There should be a study of pedestrian traffic per street. In my part of the neighbourhood, everyone walks.	
You should put the sidewalk and pedestrian slides together. That would help the discussion.	
The idea of sidewalks – I don't like them either. On Blythdale, it is a cul-de-sac, it is jammed with traffic, especially for parking for the hospital.	
One of the reasons people hate sidewalks is because of loss of property – you have to do the shovelling, and the dog walkers who are not always so good at picking up after them. But I do think we need more sidewalks than what is recommended. We know the neighbourhood is changing, and we need to realize that a new neighbourhood would have sidewalks. We know that there needs to be some more.	
For the meeting, put a time-limit on people talking to make sure people don't speak for too long and dominate the conversation.	
Sidewalks should be tailored to the traffic on the street. I thought the sidewalk policy is that the City negotiates with residents.	

The community is very divided on the sidewalk issue, but I think the most contentious places have been addressed, and I think what you've presented makes sense. If you don't deal with this in some sort of compromise way, then when people realize that there are more sidewalks than they had thought, there will be many people up in arms.	
One thing that is not clear to me is, after the PICs, what is the process if people are not happy with what is being recommended.	These are preliminary recommendations based on an analysis done by the project team. The point of the public consultation at this stage is to hear from the public about the recommendations. We then review all the input. If there is anything that needs to be addressed, then we will do that. Once the final report comes out, there is a 30 day review period. If there are objections, we ask that the public bring it to the City to work through them. If we cannot address them, those objecting can request that the Minister of Environment intervene.
How do you communicate the Final Report to residents?	We write a report to Council and Committee to seek their approval to issue a Notice of Completion. A notice is then issued to the project mailing list (those who have been involved in the process, including attendance at the PICs) and in local newspaper. People have the opportunity to go to review the report and respond to the City with their opinions or objections.
What you put in the paper doesn't explain the recommendations.	The newspaper ads will provide a link to the website where the more detailed information (i.e. copy of the report) is provided.
Why isn't there a mailing to everyone with the final recommendations?	We can look at a mail drop of the final notice to the community.
Is there a process to make comments between these preliminary recommendations and the final recommendations?	There is the 30 day review period. If there are still outstanding issues, they can be brought up during that period.
Can you comment on-line?	You can send Tracy Manolakakis an e-mail.
If in May, people at large see something like this presentation, and then the next thing we see is the final report, then I don't think there is enough information in the presentation to make a thoughtful contribution to what they want to see happening. What about talking about the individual trees that will be affected?	This is the presentation as it stands today, but there is more information that will be presented at the public meetings and also on-line. There are 18 different groupings, and for each of those there will be a big board display that gives a summary of the key points of the 8 alternatives. There will be a period after the meetings that people
	can still send comments in. Typically there is a period of 2 weeks following the public meetings to submit comments.

When it says 17 trees would be removed, does it say which they are?	No, that happens at detailed design.
Do people get input into detailed design? Those are the things that people are going to be interested in.	Yes, there is still consultation with that. At this stage we don't know details like which side of the road the sidewalk will be on and which trees will be removed.
That is a flaw in the process. I want to understand all the factors that influence the evaluation. You invite us in to detailed discussions like on the width of the pipes, but then the details are not given on the issues of great interest like which trees will be affected.	There will be an opportunity at the PICs to discuss street-by-street issues, and to explain to those interested the evaluation process and how the score came up. If we get an overwhelming response in favour of an option, we'd go ahead. If we get an overwhelming response against and option, we would revisit it.
I'm concerned that people would say that they are fine with something, but not really realize what they are agreeing to, because they don't see the details yet.	For each alternative, we can tell you at this stage which trees will stay and which will go. At the lower end, we are talking about 20% of street trees going; at the high end, we are talking about 70% of them going. Since this is still conceptual, we will still have to see whether it makes sense to focus on individual trees.
On the notice that's going out on the study process, I think you should indicate where the opportunities are for comment, including up to the Minister.	Point taken.
Is the notice sent as addressed mail?	No, it will be unaddressed mail.
I'm concerned that unaddressed mail doesn't always get delivered on time, or it just gets thrown out, or it is not delivered to those opting out of junk mail.	We don't rely on just one method – we use a variety of methods to get the word out (ads, direct mailing to everyone who has participated to date, and unaddressed mail).
Can you do a direct mailing including names and addresses?	That would exceed our staff resources.
Can you put something on the envelope to indicate this is something different?	We have had some envelopes printed with "Important Notice from the City of Toronto". If we have stock available, we can use those. Also please use your own networks to get the word out.

The meeting adjourned at 9:01 pm.

Appendix A-10: Community Advisory Group Meeting #4 Summary
M TORONTO

Lawrence Park Neighbourhood Investigation of Basement Flooding (Area 20) & Road Improvement Study Municipal Class Environmental Assessment

COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (CAG)

Meeting #4 – Lawrence Park Community Church Tuesday, April 5, 2015 7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

Attendees:

Residents: Gordon Homer Don Smith James Cheryk John Gill Tracy Eakins Peggy Judge Norma Russell Pamela Vallance Pamela Backman Lisa Donahue

Observers: Valentine Lovekin Bob Livingston Phil Crawley

Councillor's Office: Kim Farr Project Team (staff, consultants): Jackie Kennedy, Project Manager Man Kit Koo, Toronto Water Fiona Chapman, Transportation Services Mark Berkovitz, Transportation Services Shawn Dillon, Transportation Services John Kelly, Engineering and Construction Services Tracy Manolakakis, Public Consultation Dave Maunder, Aquafor Beech Dave Dilks, Lura Consulting Leah Winter, Lura Consulting

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 pm

CAG Questions and Feedback on the Presentation

Discussion Questions

- Do you have questions about the presentation?
- What advice do you have to improve the clarity of the presentation material in preparation for the upcoming Public Information Centres?

Question/Comment	Project Team Response
I am very impressed with the presentation.	Noted.

Question/Comment	Project Team Response	
Rothmere Drive is an important route to two schools (Bedford Park and Toronto French School) and it does not have a sidewalk proposed. It is also a gateway for the neighbourhood to go to Wanless Park. It is a heavily utilized street. Why is there no sidewalk proposed on Rothmere Drive? There are cars parked on both sides and people, including children, have to walk in the middle of street.	We have put forward the highest priority sidewalks in the recommendations and focused primarily on connectivity to schools, TTC stops and arterial roads. In the case of Rothmere Drive, it came out as a more modest priority in the analysis. We hear your feedback. The upcoming public meeting is another opportunity to tell us if there are points in the recommendations that we need to further address.	
Are there two options for Mildehall Road? What is the recommendation?	The recommendation for Mildenhall Road south of Lawrence Avenue is for a 7.2m road with sidewalks on both sides. Since there is not enough space for anyone to walk safely for any length of distance on a 7.2m road, two sidewalks are required on a busy road like Mildenhall Road.	
I think a 7.2m road with one sidewalk would be fine for Mildenhall Road.	Noted.	
On Dawlish Avenue there is a proposed sidewalk east of Mildenhall Road only. West of Mildenhall Road the sidewalk is proposed on Glenallan Road. This is not a continuous route. There is also a sidewalk proposed on both St. Leonard's Avenue and Dawlish Avenue east of Mildenhall Road. Why are sidewalks proposed on both streets?	Both St. Leonard's Avenue and Dawlish Avenue are direct routes to Bayview Avenue and have been identified as key linkages providing destination connections. With respect to west of Mildenhall Road, Glenallan Road was chosen for a sidewalk because it is currently a much wider road and would have less of an impact on trees.	
Regarding the current classifications of the streets, what does routine preventative maintenance mean?	Routine preventative maintenance means filling potholes and other road repairs.	
There are poor sightlines at the intersection of Dawlish and Bayview Avenue. There should be a left turn restriction onto Bayview Avenue. The hedges and sign on the church property also block views for people trying to turn right.	Noted.	
Wood Avenue was used as an example in the presentation. This road has hardly any traffic. I suggest you use another road in the presentation. People will ask why you are widening this road and removing trees.	Noted.	
I have lived in Lawrence Park since 1956. The roads have never been better. What is the project budget? Toronto needs a lot of infrastructure and this money could be much better spent elsewhere.	The budget is estimated at \$75M for all improvements to roads, sidewalks and sewers within the entire study area.	
I would like to see exactly which trees are coming down. You should go out and mark them with red ribbons before the May public meeting. This is the major concern of our neighbourhood.	We will have drawings for every street showing the assessment of trees available at the public meeting and available on-line.	
I am surprised that traffic calming is not part of the study. Traffic calming is a low cost alternative and it increases safety. This is a ten year project. Traffic calming and road reconstruction should go hand in	Traffic calming doesn't require an Environmental Assessment (EA) study to be undertaken. There is a more local process that is followed and initiated through the local Councillor. It can be done as a	

Question/Comment	Project Team Response	
hand. There could be cost savings opportunities.	standalone assessment. That being said, we don't have to wait until the end of the EA process to consider traffic calming. It makes sense to incorporate it if we are reconstructing a road. The process has to be advanced by the local community; it is based on what local residents would like to see. An important clarification to make is that traffic calming cannot be considered until there are sidewalks in place. Sidewalks are the first consideration for making a road safe for pedestrians.	
In your presentation you reference pavement width versus road width. This might be confusing and should be clarified.	Noted.	
I think it is a great presentation. I suggest you address the audience as Lawrence Park, the neighbourhood, and not as Lawrence Park proper.	Noted.	
It is important that the Councillor's office address three issues that were raised in previous meetings: - The traffic study north of Lawrence - Improving the pathway between Lawrence Ave and Wanless Park - Traffic issues at Toronto French School (need to show progress on this)	Noted.	
The information on slide 17 (Tree Summary) is difficult to read.	This information will also be available on display boards.	
Are the photos on slides 22 and 25 examples from the neighbourhood? It would be effective if they were actual local examples.	Noted.	
I don't get the sense that you are solving the flooding issues in the area north of Lawrence Avenue near Toronto French School.	Noted.	
The cost for the project is beyond what the area needs or wants. At the public meeting I urge you to be as transparent as possible with the statistics. I asked last year about the traffic census statistics and there was no answer. You need to provide more detail on the traffic volume results. Please have the statistics available at the meeting.	Noted.	
When you refer to the road width as 7.2m, does that include the sidewalks or only the road? People may want to go out and measure the distance in front of their house. You may want to include imperial measurements as well as metric.	The road width means the width from curb face to curb face. Sidewalks and curbs are in addition to that. Sidewalks are 1.5m, and the curb is 0.2m.	
I support allowing left turns from Dawlish Avenue onto Bayview Avenue.	Turning restrictions are outside of this study.	

Question/Comment	Project Team Response
Parking on Mildenhall Road poses a sightline issue. This would be relieved by sidewalks on both sides and no parking. We can't reverse out of our driveways easily because we can't see around the parked cars.	Noted.
With respect to walkability and sidewalk connections, I didn't see Wanless Park listed as a destination.	It wasn't considered a top priority destination. We hear your feedback.
You should expect that a lot of people will want to talk about the Mildenhall Road recommendation at the public meeting.	Noted.
Is there any flexibility on how wide the sidewalks and curbs can be? Narrower sidewalks are preferred, especially on quieter streets.	There is a Provincial minimum accessibility standard for sidewalks. Any new roads have to be brought up to the new standard. Exceptions can only be made for specific pinchpoints if there are extenuating circumstances but the City cannot do a whole street at a reduced sidewalk width.
I like how you showed the possibility of shifting the road to save more trees. I'm not sure if you can do that on Mildenhall Road. People will be concerned with the loss of front yard space with two sidewalks recommended.	We have over 30 illustrations that show existing conditions and proposed solutions. With the recommended solution on Mildenhall Road, the change is quite minimal.
Once Mildenhall Road gets reconstructed cars will drive even faster. Kids will still need to cross the road. The reason sidewalks are so critical is the traffic speed and volume has increased. Mildenhall Road is the one street where people should be able to comfortably pass each other on the sidewalk given the volume of traffic. But the other quieter streets don't need wide sidewalks.	7.2m is the narrowest road width that can be considered for a collector road. Traffic calming can be considered on Mildenhall Road with the recommended solution that we have put forward if there is interest from the local community.
It is surprising that the City won't address traffic calming until there are sidewalks. This concerns me. Because the study area is such a large geographic area, it is hard to find a single cohesive opinion within the LPRA. I would like to find a way to address this problem. One solution that has been discussed in the community is the option of a community poll. This method is not valuable unless there is a lot of input from residents. We would like to know if the City might assist the LPRA in drafting questions for polling purposes.	Polling is only done in certain circumstances under City procedures. Polling is not undertaken in this type of study. The EA process involves an evaluation of alternatives and bringing those forward for public comment. All comments are documented and the final recommendations are available for a 30-day review period. Polling would be undertaken for traffic calming and this is stated in the City's municipal bylaws. The City will get back to you with a response on their position on polling.
The Lawrence Park neighbourhood doesn't respond during the months of July or August. I urge you to make the 30-day public review period outside of the summer months.	It is unlikely that the review period will occur during the summer. 30 days is the minimum review period and it could always be extended if required.
Polling occurred in the case of Hogg's Hollow.	Noted.
The presentation needs to include an explanation of the City's right-of-way vs what is private property.	Noted.

Question/Comment	Project Team Response
The City needs to explain how the \$75M would be spent, relative to larger total budgets and annual operating expenses, especially when you consider the maintenance costs if the repairs are not made.	Noted.
I think there are some policies you failed to recognize in the presentation. There was no mention of Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and other guidelines that point towards sidewalks as a standard for new roads. The study has been biased towards saving trees.	Noted.
Is there an option to do two public meetings on two different nights?	There will be one public meeting. We will also provide information online and can address questions in other ways.
There are three distinct areas within Lawrence Park and they all have different identities. If the City is sending letters regarding the public meeting to the larger area, the feedback may not reflect the study area.	Noted.

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 pm.

Appendix A-11: Lawrence Park EA Resident Q&A Final October 17th, 2016

Lawrence Park Neighborhood Infrastructure Improvement Project

The project has two broad parts/tasks:

- 1. Road Reconstruction, Traffic Flow and Pedestrian Infrastructure Improvement
- 2. Surface & Basement Flooding Remediation & Wet Weather Flow Management

During public consultations with the community, these **key issues** (*PIC #1, April 22, 2013, Lura Consulting*) were articulated:

- 1. Pedestrian Safety
- 2. Tree Preservation
- 3. Deteriorating Road conditions
- 4. Traffic (excessive volume, speeding, infiltration, not stopping at Stop Signs, TFS)
- 5. Parking (parking issue on Mildenhall, lack of short-term parking in general)
- 6. Basement & Road Surface Flooding
- 7. Poor stormwater quality (contaminated runoff flowing into West Don River).

Other Issues included:

- Difficult to access transit
- Turning restrictions are inconvenient
- Some intersections have poor sight lines at the stop line.
- Drainage Problems
- No changes needed.
- Cycling

1	Pedestrian Safety
Q1	The last round of preliminary recommendations are completely void of any traffic calming best practices. In the minutes of one of the PIC or CAG meetings the facilitator commented that discussions about traffic calming were 'out of scope' of the EA Study. However, RFP 9117-12-7049, Section 2, part 1.2.1, para 1 clearly states the EA will look for an "opportunity for traffic flow and calming improvements". Addendum 2 to the RFP, answer to question 16 also says that, "speed limit, sight distance, traffic calming, etc. are design parameters that need to be developed based on the outcome of the EA". If the preliminary and final designs are to include traffic calming improvements and decisions on speed (& presumably traffic infiltration) then these topics should NOT be removed from the discussion at any upcoming PIC or CAG meetings. Would you please confirm that traffic calming will be part of the discussion at any and all of these meetings?
A1	Traffic calming is a process initiated by residents in consultation with the local councillor's office in accordance with the City's Traffic Calming Policy. Despite the language in the RFP, traffic calming cannot be addressed through the EA process due to the existing council policy. However traffic issues were assessed as part of this EA and used in development of the alternatives. For example the Traffic Report for the area bound by Mount Pleasant/Bayview/Blythwood/Lawrence shows traffic volumes are within City standards (<2500 vehicles per day on local roads; 2500-8000 vehicles per day on collector road). Also concerns with intersection sightlines were addressed with recommendations to remove or relocate the stone wall at Blythwood Road/Strathgowan Crescent and trimming of tree branches at Mount Pleasant Road/Lawrence Crescent and Mount Pleasant Road/St. Leonards Avenue.
Q2	There are many new (and existing) technologies that can be used to educate drivers and enforce existing laws in an effort to achieve safety for all users of the City's Right-of-Way (ROW). These technologies should NOT be excluded from upcoming conversations or in the design stages. And should, in fact, be top of mind in the design stages for the roadways. Would you please confirm that technology solutions will be part of upcoming discussions and considered in the design stages?
A2	New and existing technologies are always considered as part of capital projects. Staff will look to include the appropriate technologies during the design phase. Transportation Services investigates a wide variety of technologies to improve safety and operations.
Q3	Pedestrian safety is the single most important community issue. Why did none of the EA Study preliminary recommendations incorporate design elements from the <i>Vision Zero, Living City, Healthy Streets, Complete Streets</i> or other methodologies to address pedestrian & cyclist safety while ensuring even traffic flow?
A3	Based on public feedback, pedestrian safety was identified as one of several important community issues. Design elements from the above initiatives have been incorporated. While Complete Streets and Vision Zero initiatives are still under development, consideration for construction of new sidewalks is one of the recommendations of this study and a key element of these plans. As for the Living City, this is an initiative by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority that focuses on environmental sustainability and not pedestrian safety.
Q4	Last year our neighborhood lost a 72 year old resident to a collision at the intersection at Buckingham Avenue and Dinnick Crescent. The lives of the victim's family AND the driver's family have been significantly and forever affected by that tragedy. A draft of the Road Safety Strategic Plan is expected this spring and involves "a Seniors Strategy that identifies specific countermeasures aimed at improving the safety of older residents on local and arterial roads and reducing the number of fatalities and serious injuries." What are some of the best practices being considered by other cities? Would some of these best practices serve the 'rural cross- section' and 'urban cross section' areas of the neighborhood? Is there any reason that these best practices cannot be discussed at upcoming meetings and incorporated into the preliminary and detailed design stages?

A4	The City reviews best practices and looks for opportunities to update standards and guidelines. Information about the City's Road Safety Plan can be found here: <u>http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=747c4074781e1410VgnVCM1000007</u> 1d60f89BCBD Anything applicable will be considered during detailed design
Q5	Can electronic safety equipment approved for use by the City be funded by private donations from area residents? Can that equipment then be installed & maintained by the City? Can the donor(s) be recognized with a plaque on the device if so desired?
A5	At this time Transportation Services does not accept private donations to fund traffic safety equipment. Any necessary safety equipment is funded and implemented by the City.
06	Can the sidewalks be constructed of permeable (porous) concrete?
A6	The City's new Green Standards may provide alternative sidewalk materials. This will be further assessed during detailed design.
Q7	Will the installation of a storm sewer on St. Leonards Ave allow the design team the space required to install one sidewalk on the north side, catch basins on that side and safely allow parking on the south side? Would there be a swale on the south side to handle overland drainage?
A7	The storm sewer will be placed between the two curbs and is independent of the other factors mentioned. The location of the sidewalk will be determined during detailed design in consultation with local residents and with a view to minimize any potential physical impacts. Since the recommended solution includes an urban cross-section, there will be no swale. Please refer to Figure A (urban cross section) for a representative cross section.
Q8	Street lighting does not seem to be within the scope of the EA Study. However, will the need for any street lighting requirements/improvements be reviewed prior to the detailed design stage? Would this include a discussion about upgrading the current model of lamp to a more energy efficient lamp?
A8	Toronto Hydro owns and operates all street lighting and the local hydro distribution system in the City of Toronto. Any improvements to these systems are the responsibility of the utility. The City's capital project planning process provides opportunities for coordinating projects. Once the City establishes their own capital plan for road and sewer related capital improvements, all utility companies may take the opportunity to plan their own projects and work together to coordinate the sequence of the work. For further information please visit the City's MCIC webpage http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=fddd410becbc1410VgnVCM1000007 http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=fddd410becbc1410VgnVCM100007 http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=fddd410becbc1410VgnVCM100007 http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=fddd410becbc1410VgnVCM100007 http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=fddd410becbc1410VgnVCM100007 http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=fddd410becbc1410VgnVCM100007 http://www1.toronto.telity http://www1.toronto.telity http://www1.toronto.telity http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=fddd410becbc1410VgnVCM100007 http://www1.toronto.telity http://www1.toronto.telity http://www1.toronto.telity http://www1.toronto.telity http://www1.toron
2	Basement & Surface Flooding, Stormwater Quality & Drainage
Q9	Is Lawrence Park, Area #20 defined as a 'Chronic Basement Flooding Area'?
A9	Yes
Q10	Given the degree of basement flooding in the City and the complexity of the problem what priority is given to the project in Area #20, Lawrence Park?
A10	Recommended projects from all completed basement flooding EA studies, including Area 20, are sequenced into a 5-year project list to undergo engineering design and construction, in accordance with City Council adopted prioritization criteria which includes a cost not to exceed \$32,000 per benefitting property threshold.

Q11	Based on Aquafor Beech's (AB's) inspections (smoke test, CCTV inspection, field survey & other inspections) did they produce a report on a street-by-street basis, citing the current size, age and condition of the existing combined, sanitary and storm sewers as well as the drainage ditches (including culverts) and swales in the Study Area? Is that report available? Were any urgent problems uncovered that need to be addressed in the short- or medium-term?
A11	Aquafor Beech produced technical memos which summarize the type, location, size and capacity of the existing sewer system. No urgent problems were uncovered as part of the field program. The technical memos will form part of the Master Plan report which will be posted for public review.
Q12	If AB's report includes information on the condition of swales, ditches, culverts, etc., did it capture how many culverts had been removed as a result of new construction or newly-built driveways? Do City Inspectors review this when they do final inspections on newly built houses? How many fines have been laid for By-Law infractions relating to removal or altering culverts as part of the drainage system? Will the cost of replacing all of the missing culverts and repairing the unique landscaping around each individual driveway be a cost of the project or charged in some fashion to the homeowner? How will builders/ developers be held accountable to replace the culverts and maintain the drainage designs of the project? There seems to be very little enforcement of any existing By-laws.
A12	AB's report captured the existing conditions in the study area and did not report on the number of culverts that have been removed as a result of new construction or newly-built driveways as by-law enforcement is outside the scope of the study. The study recommends the implementation of an urban drainage system (i.e., storm sewers beneath the road with catch basins and curbs to capture the flow) and as such replacing any missing culverts and reinstating the swales as part of the drainage system is not required. Under Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 743-9, a homeowner can be charged with excavating without a permit or damaging/fouling the street, which holds a \$200.00 fine. Instances where a developer has removed culverts for a new infill project or house renovation, City staff conduct a
	has been collected until the removed/damaged culvert is reinstated.
0.15	
Q13	Has an overland flow assessment been done for the LP area? Based on computer simulation models by AB (and/or others), where are the overland flow pathways in the neighbourhood during extreme rainfall events? Using the modeling is it possible to identify at-risk homes in the overland flow paths during extreme rainfall events? Would the City consider sharing this modeling at a community meeting so that at-risk homeowners know they are at risk and can take preventative action (re-grading, backflow preventer or sump pump installation, disconnect foundation drains/weepers from sewer, etc.)?
A13	An overland flow assessment model was established. The model generally shows the flow patterns on a block by block basis. All of the preventive actions you have listed are recommended for homeowners, regardless of overland flow conditions.
Q14	Will the end of the useful life of the current gas lines & other buried utility equipment, water main, storm sewer, sanitary sewer and combined sewer infrastructure roughly match the end of the useful life of the new road beds being constructed?

A14	The useful life varies significantly for different utilities based on materials and technology. The end of the useful life of utilities is determined by the Owner of each utility. Once the City identifies a plan for rehabilitation or replacement of City assets other Owners (utilities) will be notified so that they may assess and identify whether it is an appropriate time to rehabilitate, replace or upgrade their own assets. Any additional utility work will be coordinated with City work. Please also see A8.
Q15	There are several catch basins on Rochester Ave., east of Mildenhall Road. Does this mean that the storm sewer on St. Aubyns may reach further west on Rochester Ave. than the maps indicate? Or do those catch basins feed into the sanitary sewer line?
A15	The ditch/drainage system along Rochester Ave., which includes catch basins, drains to the storm sewer systems on St. Aubyns Cres and St. Leonards Ave.
Q16	"In the rural cross-section there is still a (storm) sewer, but it is underneath the ditches." (<i>CAG</i> #2, pg. #6, section 4.6, Clarifications from the City). To clarify, does that refer to a perforated storm sewer pipe under a swale? Is this the suggested design for streets that currently have the deep, open ditches, which are both a pedestrian and vehicular safety issue? (i.e.: St. Leonards Ave., Dawlish Ave., Rochester Ave.)
A16	The rural cross section would have a perforated pipe underneath a shallow swale. The preferred road cross section for all streets to be reconstructed is shown in Figure A (see attached).
Q17	Given the steep grade on St. Leonards Ave, Rochester Ave., Dawlish Ave. & others that are east of St. Ives; will some type of erosion control measures be required in the ditches/swales?
A17	The proposed road cross section is shown in Figure A. Since there will not be any ditches or swales, there will not be any need for erosion control structures.
Q18	Do the models developed by AB support leaving/repairing the current swales and converting smaller asphalt-lined ditches to swales on all other local roads in the Study Area? Or did the models suggest the swales/ditches be eliminated and storm sewers & catch-basins be added?
A18	Two cross-section were evaluated, an urban cross-section (curbs, gutters, catchbasins and storm sewers) versus a rural cross-section (swales), as part of the roads requiring reconstruction which was a separate process from the hydraulic model developed by AB. Based on a number of evaluation criteria related to socio-cultural impacts, technical effectiveness and economic impacts, an urban cross-section was identified as preferred (see Figure A).
Q19	Is the design objective of the storm sewer system (major & minor) to handle a 100-year storm? (<i>CAG #2, pg. #5, section 4.5</i>) Given the number of significant rainfall events over the last several years has the definition of a 100-year storm been modified? In light of the frequency of ever-worsening storm events is there a 'future' factor used in the 100-year storm calculation or is the calculation only historically based?
A19	The design objective is for the storm drainage system to handle City's 100-year design storm.
	The City's current 100-year design storm was updated in the 2000's to reflect recent meteorological conditions. For comparison, the peak intensity of the updated 100-year design storm is greater than the July 8, 2013 severe rain storm which resulted in significant flooding events across the City.
	Basement flooding studies for all areas, including Lawrence Park, are utilizing the City's updated 100-year design storm.

Q20	Are the improvements to the sanitary sewer lines on Wood Ave, Rochester Ave and St. Aubyns Cres to create inline storage during high wet weather flows? If yes, and given the number of trees affected in that construction zone on Wood Ave., could the size of underground storage tanks on Valleyanna Drive be increased to achieve the same net result? Valleyanna Drive is an 8.0m (+) wide road versus 6.0m on Wood Ave. giving construction crews significantly more working space. And it would appear that there are far less trees affected with a Valleyanna Drive solution – would that be a fair observation?
A20	impacts. The tree impacts identified on Wood Ave, Rochester Ave and St Aubyns Cresent are attributed to the construction width of the recommended road reconstruction. The sanitary sewer work on these streets is not the determining factor in the tree impacts.
Q21	When AB was doing its field confirmation of the location and numbers of catch basins in the Study Area, part of the information required was identifying if catch basins were missing or not found (RFP, pg.#132, sections 2.4 Catch Basins). Were any identified as being missing or not found? If so, are these slated for repair in the near future to reduce risk of flooding until final construction of the project is completed? Is there an original map of catch basin locations from the original installation/construction? The dates on some of the sanitary sewer covers are 1959/1960.
A21	AB's field program involved collecting existing information from the City and then confirming the location and type of catch basin in the field, thereby verifying if there were any missing or not found in the City's database. The exercise did not look at the condition of the catch basins. Where improvement works are proposed, catch basins will be assessed and replaced if necessary.
022	When AB was doing its field confirmation of catch basins, culverts, etc. did they (or anyone
QZZ	else) report on their current operating condition? Did anyone report if a catch basin was plugged? Or ineffective because it was above grade? Were any culverts reported as being plugged and incapable of passing water?
A22	Please refer to the response for Q21. Also note that as part of regular yearly maintenance inspections, Transportation Services does look for and clear road drainage issues that can be addressed through cleaning of culverts or clearing of catchbasins.
000	Will the establishes or computers also inline require water treatment (i.e.; Oil/Crit Separator)
Q23	of some kind to remove pollutants? Or will all water treatment be dealt with at the Treatment Plant(s).
A23	The study recommends perforated pipes to infiltrate stormwater as a source control measure which reduces pollutants reaching the receiving system (i.e., watercourses). These perforated pipes are shown in Figure A. Additional water quality measures will be considered, where feasible, during detailed design. Sanitary sewers convey sewage to the waste water treatment plant where it is treated before it is discharged to the receiving system.
Q24	According to the curb-view survey done by AB, how many homes in the Study Area have
	reversed driveways? (RFP, pg. #131, section 2.3, Depressed/Reverse Driveways)
A24	There are approximately 150 reverse grade driveways in the Study Area.
Q25	The old North York part of Lawrence Park (roughly Study Area #20) with its mature, rural cross- section and support by the residents for tree and greenspace preservation, seems to be the perfect blank canvas to create a new revitalization model using Low Impact Design (LID) practices. What type of LID source controls (including inlet controls, pervious pavement, subsurface infiltration, soak away pits, rain gardens, infiltration beds, bioretention swales, tree planting, etc.) (CAG #2, PP presentation, pg. #8) will be considered in the design for the Study Area?

A25	LID measures that are proposed include the perforated pipe system as shown in Figure A. The system, as illustrated, is consistent with the requirements of the City's Wet Weather Flow Management Master Plan (WWFMMP).
Q26	The City's RFP cites that there are 500 properties in the Study Area but an actual count of homes on a map of the study area indicates that there are approx 1277 homes in the Study
	Area. Can the actual number of homes be reconfirmed?
A26	Yes, there are approximately 1200 properties with the full study area, based on a count of property addresses contained in the City's database.
007	How many now homes have been built in the Study Area since the Building Code changed
Q27	necessitating the inclusion of a backwater valve?
A27	This information has not been examined as part of our study. This information can be requested from Toronto Buildings at <u>NYBldgCS@toronto.ca</u> . However, there are a number of measures, including backwater valves that the City recommends all homeowners implement in order to protect against basement flooding. These measures do not preclude the City from undertaking infrastructure upgrades/improvements within the right of way.
Q28	How many of the older homes in the Study Area have taken advantage of the City's 'Backwater Valve Program'?
A28	On the City's Open data website we provide information on the number of subsidies issued by ward (Lawrence Park falls into Ward 25). This information relates to all subsidies, which include backwater valve, sump pump and capping of the weeping tile connection. Please note that not all property owners will apply to the City for a rebate. All residents are encouraged to take advantage of this program but this will not change the outcome of this study.
Q29	How many new homes or older homes with backwater valves have experienced flooding due to sewer backups?
A29	The results of our questionnaire to all property owners in the area shows that of 327 respondents, 11 have reported having a backwater valve installed and also have reported flooding. It is also important to note that not all reports of flooding will be reported to the City and that backwater valves must be installed properly and maintained. Finally, sewer backup is not the only cause of basement flooding.
Q30	Lou di Gironimo, past GM of Toronto Water estimated (Feb. 23, 2006) that, based on computer modeling, that "at least 50% - 60% of the downspouts in a typical residential area must be disconnected" to achieve adequate results. The downspout disconnection program's completion date was targeted as at the end of 2013. Information from PIC public consultations, presumably from AB's survey and estimates, reports that the downspout disconnect percentage for the Study Area is 41%. If this data came from AB's research then this data was likely collected in 2012/2013 – correct? Is there a more up-to-date estimate of the current downspout disconnect rate?
A30	The 41% value came from a street by street assessment carried out for the study in 2013 and is the most up to date information. Also note that Lou Di Gironimo is the current GM of Toronto Water.
021	If the downshout disconnect program is over, are there secondary efforts/plane ourrently
	underway to increase the downspout disconnection rate and eventually reach "100% participation" (Di Gironimo)? Is there some point at which increased compliance has a negligible reduction on sewer surcharge during an extreme event? Or does every little bit help?

A31	While the bylaw requiring the disconnection of downspouts has come into effect across the City, the City will continue to provide enhanced education, communication and outreach to achieve further compliance. Computer simulation modelling has shown that 100% attainment of downspout disconnection is not required in order to achieve a significant reduction in the risk of basement flooding. It should be further noted that the bylaw respecting downspout disconnection. See also A35.
Q32	There is clearly a benefit to adding a storm sewer starting on Dundurn Rd and continuing east on St. Leonards Ave to Mildenhall Rd. where only a combined sewer currently exists. However, what are the recommended solutions to upgrade/replace the derelict & dangerous drainage ditches along St. Leonards Ave. from Mildenhall Rd to Bayview Ave.? How will they be designed to handle, not only the existing flows, but also the additional flow from the new storm sewer upstream? Also, is there an argument to be made to add a storm sewer on Dundurn Rd between St. Leonards Ave and Dawlish Ave? Then this area is nearly 100% upgraded.
A32	The recommendations along St. Leonards Ave. from Mildenhall to bayview will include new storm sewers with adequate capacity to convey storm flows. The storm sewers will be built at the same time the road is reconstructed with an urban cross section. There is no need for an additional storm sewer on Dundurn between St. Leonards and Dawlish as the existing system has adequate capacity.
Q33	Figure 11 in RFP 9117-12-7049 is a Feb. 23, 2006 letter from then GM of Toronto Water, Lou Di Gironimo to the Works Department. On page 150/165 of the RFP he notes that three engineering consultant firms were hired to recommend improvements to provide sufficient protections from flooding during a storm equivalent to the May 12, 2000 storm. One of the main recommendations was, "sewer separation in combined sewer service areas". Notwithstanding the treatment of stormwater discussion, and with storms increasing in intensity and frequency, is there a case to be made to also add a storm sewer to Pinedale Rd, Strathgowan Cres., Blythwood Rd. and others in the immediate vicinity of currently planned work? Is there no benefit to connect these to Blythwood Rd storm sewer line and the outflow, which I think is in Sherwood Park ravine?
A33	Storm sewers are recommended as part of the road reconstruction works (i.e., 26 streets identified as requiring road reconstruction). For these roads, the City examined two types of road drainage systems: urban (curb + storm sewer + catchbasins) and rural (ditch), with urban drainage being preferred. Storm sewers are also recommended within the area presently serviced by combined sewers to address basement flooding.
Q34	Further, according to the information provided on maps from PICs, the area north of Lawrence Ave. (several streets in the area around Braeside Cr. & Wanless Cres) have flooding issues as well. The maps indicate that they still have a combined sewer system. Again, notwithstanding the treatment of stormwater discussion, if source controls are not working to control basement and surface flooding then wouldn't the addition of storm sewers be a prudent solution to the flooding problem in the area? Could the same argument be made for the streets around Mount Pleasant & Blythwood, which still have combined sewers?
A34	The area north of Lawrence is serviced by storm and sanitary sewers. Flooding in this general area is caused by back-up in the sanitary sewer system. Increasing the size of the sanitary sewer system in the Valleyanna Dr, Bayview Ave, Wood Ave, Rochester Ave and Cheltenham Ave will alleviate flooding which is related to back-up in the existing sanitary sewer system. Recommendations to alleviate flooding associated with surcharging of the combined sewer system in the Mount Pleasant Ave and Blythwood Ave area have also been made, including the works proposed on Dundurn Rd, Glengowan Ave and St. Leonards Rd.
Q35	Is there a plan to encourage homes that are considered 'partially separated' to take measures to become 'completely separated'?

105	
A35	In 2007, City Council adopted a bylaw making it mandatory to disconnect existing downspouts and prohibiting new connections. The requirement to disconnect has been implemented across the City in three phases. A property owner may qualify for an exemption, in certain circumstances, where it can be demonstrated that the disconnection would create a hazardous condition or is not technically feasible for existing properties.
	The City is achieving compliance with the requirements primarily through a combination of education, communications, and outreach initiatives based on available resources. A compliance survey is underway to determine the success rate of compliance and consider different approaches in the future to enhance levels of participation.
Q36	In most of the Preliminary Recommendations document, the text on many slides says that, " meets requirements for improved stormwater quality" How do removing mature trees, building new roads, sidewalks and curbs translate into improved stormwater quality? (I'm sure this was just part of the 'preliminary' text but never-the-less it's sloppy communication.)
A36	The requirements for improved stormwater quality are met by infiltrating the stormwater via perforated pipes. As the stormwater infiltrates into the surrounding soils, the volume of stormwater and the pollutants carried by the stormwater are diverted away from outfalls and receiving watercourses.
Q37	The Preliminary Recommendations suggest that the upgrade to Bayview Wood (removing 34 trees & widening the road) will improve stormwater quality. How would this recommendation be an improvement over having 100% of the stormwater flow into the park, be absorbed by the trees, grass & other vegetation and any overflow diverted into the catch basin in the lowest spot on the opposite side of the park? Isn't this rural cross-section a real-life example of LID design, an example for infiltration as laid out in the Wet Weather Flow Management Program (WWF MP) Guidelines (November 2006) and pretty much what the Living City guidelines suggest?
A37	The proposed solution is consistent with the WWFMP with respect to water quality improvements and flooding protection. Also note that the urban cross-section selected was based on a number of criteria (see A18). At the design stage alternatives such as those mentioned in your response will be considered, where feasible.
Q38	Through AB's review of historical soil and borehole data and collection of other data did they confirm whether or not groundwater levels contribute to basement and surface flooding problems? If yes, how does it specifically contribute to the basement flooding problems homeowners face? What solutions for homeowners did they suggest to mitigate these types of flooding problem?
A38	While ground water levels were not specifically monitored, the flow monitoring data showed that infiltration into the pipes during dry weather periods was not significant. This would suggest that groundwater levels are not high and do not specifically contribute to basement flooding problems in Lawrence Park.
030	Discharges from combined sewer overflows and storm sewers were identified as principal
Q39	Discharges from combined sewer overnows and storm sewers were identified as principal sources of pollution in the City's 2003 WWF MP. The Don River and Central Waterfront Project executive summary report (MMM Group, Aug 2012) outlines very specific, large-scale solutions/strategies for Combined Service Outfall (CSO) and stormwater outfall issues in support of the WWF MP. What suggestions or solutions did AB's modeling contribute to that discussion and how will it impact the overall design of the sewer systems for the neighborhood?
A39	The modelling carried out for the Lawrence Park Neighbourhood study did not impact the findings of the 2012 MMM study. The Don River and Central Waterfront project study was undertaken at a higher (coarser) level and was undertaken in response to the findings from the 2003 WWFMP study.

Q40	Are sewer inspections and sewer cleaning scheduled on a rotation basis? Or done only as required?	
A40	The City maintains a standard of practice that involves cleaning sanitary and combined sewers once every five years or as required (i.e., more of less frequent depending on the results of inspections) and cleaning of storm sewers as required. The sewer cleaning program is aided by the review of closed circuit television and visual inspection/historic data.	
041	When was the last time that the sewers in the Study Area were cleaned?	
A41	 Sewer maintenance activities have been completed to some parts of the Study Area. Some examples of maintenance activities completed within the study area include: Nov 2012 - flushing for CCTV inspections July 2014 - CCTV inspection Oct/Nov 2014 - Maintenance Hole inspections 	
Q42	Did the results of the soil chemical analysis completed by AB for sub-surface investigation produce anything noteworthy or of concern? Is there any concerns related to old landfill sites that may have previously existed in the area, old leaking septic or oil tanks buried on private property, or other issues?	
A42	The soils work that was completed by the geotechnical firm shows that some of the soils are suitable for disposal on residential lands while others may be disposed on industrial or commercial lands. This information is useful for determining soil disposal methods/costs when future excavation is undertaken to install new sewers.	
Q43	According to documentation (RFP, addendum #2, Q#25) "Some of the existing infrastructure appears to extend beyond the ROW and through private properties". Is there any expectation that property will need to be acquired to carry out any of the project work related to the EA Study? Are there City procedures for carrying out City work on private property whereby the property owner is reimbursed for access and the area affected is returned to its original state?	
A43	There will be a requirement to acquire easements in order to outlet flows from one or more of the sewershed areas. The City will be contacting affected landowners to discuss easement requirements. This item will be addressed further during the design stage.	
3	Tree Preservation	
Q44	When will the complete text of the <i>Tree Inventory Report</i> prepared by Abboud & Assoc. in 2013 be available?	
A44	The Tree Inventory Report will be included in our final study report, which is made available during the 30-day review period.	
Q45	The preliminary recommendation suggested a <i>tree removal strategy</i> which is apparently being amended. However, more specifically, what is the <i>tree preservation</i> <i>strategy</i> ? What will be the on-going plan to support the long-term health of the affected trees 5 – 7 years after the construction project is completed to ensure their continued health and survival?	
A45	The tree preservation strategy will involve measures to reduce the impact on existing trees by avoiding construction near trees where possible and where construction near trees cannot be avoided, the City will apply progressive techniques during the design, construction and post construction stages. During the construction and post-construction phases, the techniques selected will be based on recommendations by an on-site arborist.	
Q46	It costs the City \$72 on average, to buy and plant a tree (<i>City website</i>). Would the City, is some cases, consider buying and planting larger $(10' - 15')$ trees from a tree farm like Hill's Tree Service? What would be the incremental cost to buy & plant a larger tree?	

A46	As indicated in the question, this cost is an average based upon various types of tree planting completed by the City.
	Trees purchased by the City for planting on road allowance or within Parks are typically within the range of 8 ft – 10 ft tall. Costs increase significantly when purchasing trees of a larger size. Smaller trees adapt and recover faster to transplanting, often catching up to or exceeding larger stock planted at the same time. Therefore, it is much more cost effective and efficient to use the stock sizes currently in use by the City.
Q47	Mayor Tory pledged to plant 3.8 million trees over the next decade and to double the City's tree- planting budget by 2019. How can the Lawrence Park community and the LPRA work with the City/Urban Forestry to identify where trees could be planted within the City's ROW as well as in its parks & ravines?
A47	Residents can contact 311 (<u>www.toronto.ca/311</u>) to submit a request for a tree to be planted on the ROW. The City's Urban Forestry staff will follow up on all requests. Residents are also encouraged to plant trees on their private property as almost 60% of land in Toronto is privately owned.
Q48	Are there any at risk species or otherwise important trees in Lawrence Park that the Tree Inventory report identified as needing protection under a Tree Heritage provision?
A48	No trees as such have been identified within the Study Area.
040	What is the estimated number of trace that will have to be removed on Valleyenne Dr. where
Q49	the proposed new sanitary sewer and underground storage tank will be constructed? They have two large medians with mature trees along the construction path.
A49	As part of the evaluation of alternatives, it was estimated that the preferred sanitary sewer system solution of conveyance and in-line storage which included sanitary sewer upgrades on several streets and an in-line storage facility on Valleyanna Drive results in less than 20% of moderate to high caliber trees being impacted. This solution was selected as it resulted in the least impacts across multiple criteria. At the detailed design stage, we will undertake detailed engineering work to define the construction width and further assess the potential tree impacts and opportunities to minimize potential impacts.
050	Will any work need to done in the treed area leading east from Valleyanna Drive, east along
QUU	Sunnybrook Estates, towards the Don River? If yes, how many trees will need to be removed in that effort?
A50	A sanitary sewer connection to the existing sanitary trunk sewer located in the valley will be required. An assessment of potential impacts to the environment and mitigation measures will be documented in the EA report. Further details will be assessed at the design stage, including construction techniques such as tunneling to minimize any tree impacts. This work will be reviewed with the conservation authority.
Q51	Did the Tree Inventory report include trees in the Toronto end of Lawrence Park? If not, what is the estimated number of trees that will have to be removed along Dundurn Rd, St. Leonards Ave. and Glengowan Rd. where the proposed upgrades to the storm sewer will be constructed?

A51	The tree inventory did include the entire Study Area. The estimated number of trees to be removed was established based on the construction width required for the recommended road improvement solution. The estimated number of trees to be removed is included in Table 1 appended at the end of the questions and answers. Further assessments of tree impacts and opportunities to reduce these impacts will be carried out at the design, construction and post-construction phases.
	The storm sewer upgrades noted above address basement flooding issues in the combined sewer system of this Study. Similar to the solution discussed in A49, the preferred solution which includes capacity upgrades was selected as it resulted in the least impacts across multiple criteria. During the detailed design stage, we will undertake detailed engineering work to define the construction width and further assess the potential tree impacts and opportunities to minimize potential impacts.
4	Road Conditions
Q52	When were the roads in the Study Area built? Have they been 'fully reconstructed' at any point since?
A52	The roads in the former (pre-amalgamation in 1998) City of Toronto were originally built in about 1930. A few of these streets have been reconstructed but most have only been maintained and repaired (surfaces repaved) since their original construction. The roads in the former (pre-amalgamation in 1998) City of North York were predominantly built in about 1960. A few roads in this area were reconstructed in later years (1980's and 1990's) and can be identified by the existing concrete curbs.
Q53	How long before the primary 'local' roads (Mildenhall Rd, St. Leonards Ave, Dawlish Ave) reach total failure if only annual, minor repair work is completed?
A53	This assessment would vary on a street by street basis and would be dependent on the existing condition of the street together with the volume and type of traffic on each street. Another consideration includes weather conditions (i.e., number of freeze-thaw cycles).
Q54	Are the roads slated for Full Depth Reconstruction beyond the point where Full-Depth Reclamation is a viable alternative?
A54	Once the condition of existing roads reaches a certain point, measures such as repaying become non effective as the sub base material provides inadequate support. Thus, complete reconstruction involving the removal and replacement of existing material is required.
Q55	Why didn't the preliminary recommendations for road design incorporate elements of Complete Streets, Vision Zero or other methodologies? A road design incorporating these methodologies can be used as a foundation for subsequent engineered, education and enforcement elements to be added at later stages.
A55	Vision Zero and Complete Streets initiatives at the City of Toronto began after the initiation of the EA study. Elements of Complete Streets and Vision Zero have been incorporated with the consideration for construction of new sidewalks.
Q56	Mildenhall Road was designed, built and originally classified as a 'local' road. The classification was changed in 1999/2000 when there was still bus service running on it. However, there is no longer a bus route on Mildenhall. Based on the current functional levels of Mildenhall Road, what is involved having Mildenhall Road reclassified as a 'local' road?
A56	Mildenhall Road is classified as a collector road based on the operational characteristics of the road, which include providing traffic movement and property access, a weekday traffic volume of 2,500 to 8,000 vehicles, access to local, collector and arterial roads and signalization at Lawrence Ave E. Reclassification would not change these characteristics but could result in a reduction in services, including snow removal and maintenance.

Q57	As part of Task A and Task B, AB had 90 boreholes drilled? What were the locations of those boreholes? Did they rely on historical data from previously drilled boreholes? If yes, how old were those reports and where were those holes drilled? What laboratory did the analysis of the new & historical core samples? Where can AB's final geotechnical reports for Task A & Task B be found?
A57	A geotechnical assessment was conducted in 2013. Boreholes were located throughout the study area. A copy of the geotechnical report was made available for viewing at PIC#2. This report will be part of the Master Plan Report which will be posted for public review.
Q58	The Preliminary Recommendations propose that all local roads be widened to 7.2M, although it appears that some will now only be widened to 6.6M. The MH traffic study clearly shows that Wood Ave., Wanless Cres., Glengowan Rd/Glenallan Rd & Daneswood Road are entry points for infiltration into the neighbourhood. How is this recommendation for wider roads a responsible recommendation, especially when the recommendations do not simultaneously include engineered traffic calming solutions in conjunction with education strategies and ongoing enforcement commitments?
A58	The City Standard is 8.5 m road width with one sidewalk. The recommendations include a narrower road width while ensuring adequate access for emergency and service vehicles, space for pedestrians and cyclists, safe two-way traffic flow, and to accommodate winter road maintenance. As noted above, traffic calming is outside the scope of the EA as it is a process initiated by residents in consultation with the local councillor's office in accordance with the City's Traffic Calming Policy.
Q59	PIC #3 suggests that Valleyanna Dr. will need only "Routine Preventative Maintenance". However, it appears that the entire length of this road will need to be dug up including the removal of at least one large median with mature trees to accommodate the upgrade to the sanitary sewer line and the installation of the underground storage tank. Won't the entire road and at least the one median need to be rebuilt?
A59	The portions of road (both length and width) that are dug up due to the installation of a new sanitary sewer would be reconstructed. At this time it is anticipated that the remaining portion of the roadway would remain as is.
Q60	Since Valleyanna Dr. is 8.0M or wider and has no sidewalk; will a sidewalk be built on Valleyanna Dr.?
A60	A sidewalk is not recommended for Valleyanna Drive as Valleyanna Drive is not being considered for road reconstruction.
Q61	Is permeable (porous) asphalt a viable alternative to use on roads in our climate?
A61	The City currently does not have a standard that has been tested and reviewed for constructing permeable (porous) asphalt. Generally these pavements are not deemed suitable for our climate given that they are conducive to retaining water with a slow release rate and the multiple freeze thaw cycles experienced during our winters. These conditions impact the state of good repairs and lead to the roads deteriorating faster than with standard asphalt.
Q62	If 1,280 is the approximate number of homes in the Study Area and given the rate of development in the Study Area, is there an argument to be made to wait and rebuild the roads at the latest possible date in order to reduce damage to the roads caused by heavy-use vehicle related to construction?

A62	Where the City is aware of a significant site redevelopment (i.e., plan of subdivision, precinct plan, etc.) abutting road work may be delayed until the completion of the development. This is not applicable in the case of individual residential properties.
	Further, the rate of re-development and major improvements of individual private properties in mature areas of the City has become relatively continuous when observed in areas greater than fifty years of age. As a result, the City's plans for road reconstruction and individual property re-development cannot be tied together.
	Roads are designed and built to accommodate use by all types of vehicles (e.g., construction, garbage, emergency services, etc.).
5	Traffic Conditions
Q63	I think it is safe to state that many, if not most residents in the Study Area would agree that a high number of vehicles do not operate within a tolerable range of the posted 40 km/h speed limit (+/- 10 km/h). Why didn't the Preliminary Recommendations include any recommendations to reduce and control vehicle speed?
A63	Issues with respect to speed and traffic calming are addressed through a separate process which may be initiated by residents through the Councillor.
Q64	Although traffic was one of the key issues in the EA Study, why didn't any of the recommendations presented look at reducing traffic infiltration – a known and serious problem?
A64	Traffic infiltration was considered in the study. Findings of the Traffic Report for the area bound by Mt Pleasant/Bayview/Blythwood/Lawrence show traffic volumes are within City standards (<2500 vehicles per day on local roads; 2500-8000 vehicles per day on collector road).
Q65	How can a meaningful traffic analysis of the Study Area exclude the influence of traffic from the minor and major arterial roadways bordering the Study Area?
A65	The traffic study did consider the traffic flow from Lawrence Avenue, Bayview Avenue, Blythwood Road and Mount Pleasant Road.
Q66	Arguably one of the highest, if not the highest pedestrian volume in the Study Area is along Mildenhall Road between Blythwood and Lawrence Ave. Many are TFS & Crescent School students but many others, including seniors walk along this roadway every day. Notwithstanding the discussion of a sidewalk on Mildenhall, what is the process to request a reduction to the speed limit (reduced to 30km/h) on Mildenhall Road from Rochester Ave., north along Cheltenham Park and leading up to the crosswalk at Lawrence Ave.(TFS)?
A66	The City of Toronto 30 km/h speed limit policy requires a petition signed by 25% of affected households to consider a 30 km/h limit. Upon receipt of the petition a study would be initiated that would review the other policy criteria. This can proceed independent of the EA Study.
6	Parking
Q67	With residents & drivers experiencing safety concerns relating to parked cars on Mildenhall Road, a lack of planned parking, excessive parking volume from Glendon College students and other issues, will a more in-depth analysis of street parking be undertaken and discussed with the residents prior to the final design stage?
A67	Specific parking regulations will be considered during the design stage, where they are required to accommodate the recommendations. For instance a reduced road width of 6.6m would not allow on-street parking.

Q68	Can angle parking on Mildenhall Road along the length of Cheltenham Park, similar to the angle parking on McRae Dr. beside Trace Manes Park in Leaside, be considered in the design plan?
	This would provide safe parking for about 20 vehicles where today it's really a free for all in a bit of a mud pit. A defined parking area for people using the park, in conjunction with a defined crosswalk at the intersection of Cheltenham Ave. & Mildenhall Rd. and a 30km/h speed limit beside the park would create a significantly safer environment for at risk pedestrians. This is
	especially true if there are future upgrade plans for the park that would increase its use.
A68	Transportation Services does not support the creation of new angled parking due to concerns with motorists reversing onto a roadway between parked vehicles that obstruct visibility. This would be a concern on Mildenhall Rd. Lay-by parking will be considered during detailed design if there is interest from the community.
7	Other Issues
Q69 A69	 Given that this project will not likely begin for several years can temporary measures/solutions be undertaken to address: Pedestrian safety (create safer, more defined walking zone on Mildenhall Road, increase safety in crosswalks at Mt. Pleasant & Lawrence and on Blythwood Rd., others. Traffic speed (additional stop signs, speed 'humps'[not bumps], radar speeds signs) Traffic infiltration (same above) Repairs needed to drainage ditches, culverts, swales and catch basins Continued pavement preservation and maintenance Tree pruning (removal of old limbs) Planting new trees (look for opportunities in ROW, parks & ravines) Parking problems on Mildenhall Rd near Blythwood Rd. Continuation of Downspout Disconnection program in the Study Area Continuation of installation of backflow valves in the Study Area. On-going maintenance work will continue until capital works are undertaken. Also refer to A63 and A66 for information related to downspout disconnections and backwater valve installations.
Q70	Is there some point in the design process where Landscape Architects get involved in the process? It seems that we have a unique opportunity to modernized and revitalize W.S. Brooke's design of W.S. Dinnick's vision for a garden community but also protect all users of the City's Right of Way as well as protect homes from the severe effects of ever-increasing storm events.
A70	At this time it is not expected that landscape architects will be involved in the detailed design. During the detailed design phase the City will issue an RFP for professional services to be led by an engineering firm. If necessary depending on the work proposed, provisional services may include landscape architects. Alternatively, the City can engage City staff who are registered Landscape Architects to provide input during detailed design.
Q71	Why is the Study Area designed so differently from the 'Toronto' portion of Lawrence Park? (road widths, sidewalks, sewers, etc.)
A71	The study area is made up of two areas that are distinct in that the portion west of St. Ives Avenue was the former municipality of Toronto, and the area to the east was the former municipality of North York. The former municipalities had different standards. The recommendations in this study are based on current technical requirements standards and policies, and assess impacts on all aspects of the environment, the community and stakeholders.
072	The preliminary recommendations included a map with plans for 18 areas constituting of the
	majority of the Study Area. However, Lawrence Ave., Bayview Ave and Valleyanna Drive were not included? What are the preliminary recommendations for these three streets?

A72	The areas referred to in your question are streets within Lawrence Park that require road reconstruction. There is no road reconstruction works proposed for Lawrence Avenue, Bayview Avenue or Valleyanna Drive. There are basement flooding recommendations on Bayview Ave and Valleyanna Drive as shown on a separate map.			
Q73	A proposed capital budget of \$150M is rumored for this project. Is this correct? If not, what is the preliminary budget cost for this project?			
A73	The cost for all improvements is estimated at \$75 million and would be funded through the City's capital budget which covers all state of good repair work and investment in maintaining City assets.			
Q74	Given that this project will likely be scheduled several years down the road, what percentage is used to account for inflation in the proposed budget?			
A74	Typically costs are provided for a specific year (i.e. 2016). Adjustments are made as part of updating capital budgets on an annual basis.			
Q75	Has there been an estimate of the reduction in maintenance costs after the project is completed? If yes, how much?			
A75	No estimate as to the reduction in maintenance costs has been made as part of this study.			
Q76	Who will be responsible for snow removal on the new sidewalks?			
A76	In much of Toronto, the City provides sidewalk snow clearing. Snow clearing on sidewalks depends on the usage of the sidewalks and the amount of snow fallen. For example, the City will clear snow from high volume pedestrian sidewalks (arterial roads, school zones, transit areas) after 8 cm of snow has fallen during the months of November and April and after 2cm of snow December, January, February & March. Low volume pedestrian routes (collector roads, local roads) will be cleared after 8 cm has fallen.			
	In some parts of Toronto, (mainly the core area), the City is unable to provide this service. For new sidewalks in the Lawrence Park neighbourhood, Transportation Services staff will examine the level of service during the development of detailed designs.			
Q77	Is the removal of a culvert in driveway that is part of the drainage system a violation of City Bylaws? If yes, which By-law? How does one go about reporting a violation like that?			
A77	Please refer A12.			
Q78	Once the budget for this project has been approved by City Council will the project be broken down into smaller stages to be completed over a period of months or years? If yes, what is the total estimated length of the project in months or years?			
A78	Once the Mater Plan Report has been approved, the City can begin to consider the budgetary impacts of the recommended solutions and their sequencing. These recommended solutions include improvements to the sanitary sewage system, road structures and related storm drainage system, and new sidewalks. There are about twenty individual projects within the Study Area so a multi-year plan to construct all of these projects will be required and completed after the approval of the Master Plan Report. It is anticipated that it will take at least ten years to build all of these projects. The budget will be approved on a project-by-project basis. Please also refer to A14.			
Q79	Is there data from traffic/pedestrian counts to support the need for sidewalks on Pinedale Rd & Glenallen Bd 2			
A79	It is the City's practice to recommend that local roads have a sidewalk on at least one side. The City's Walking Strategy also strongly recommends that road reconstruction is the best time to add sidewalks as it is more cost-effective and less disruptive to area residents.			

	Sidewalks are an important safety feature which define a safe path of travel for pedestrians. They are also particularly helpful for our most vulnerable citizens – children on their way to school and older citizens who may travel more slowly. In the winter, snow and ice and limited daylight hours can make sharing the road with cars more of a challenge. This study has looked at providing a sidewalk on streets that connect to key destinations, such as schools and transit stops, and to develop connections between the west and east portions of the neighbourhood. Sidewalks on Pinedale Road and Glenallen Road provide connections to the schools in the immediate vicinity.
Q80	According to the Request for Proposal, #9117-12-7049, Section 5 – Proposal Evaluation and Selection – "the Selection Committee may at its sole discretion retain additional committee members or advisors". If it has not already been done, can a member from each of the Ratepayers Associations/Condo Associations within the Study Area be retained to the Selection Committee making the "final and binding" decisions?
A80	This has already been completed. It refers to the committee of City staff who evaluated

During		Approximate	Number of	Number of	Number of
Project	Representative Street Name	Total Number	Trees to be	Trees to be	Trees not
ID		of Trees	removed	preserved	impacted
1	Mildenhall Rd	137	29	43	65
2	Buckingham Ave	59	7	9	43
3	Cheltenham Ave	44	3	9	32
4	Rochester Ave	77	6	13	58
5	St. Leonards Ave	79	11	20	48
6	Lewes Cres, Pembury Ave	39	4	8	27
7	Dawlish Ave	54	14	14	26
8	Glenallan Rd, Pinedale Rd, Strathgowan Cres	80	1	12	67
9	Stratheden Rd, Strathgowan Cres	58	2	8	48
10A	Garland Ave, Strathgowan Ave	42	5	12	25
10B	Strathgowan Ave	35	1	8	26
11	Blyth Hill Rd	86	3	6	77
12	Blyth Dale Rd, Blanchard Rd	79	2	9	68
13	Braeside Cres, Proctor Cres	28	0	8	20
14	Rothmere Dr	48	2	8	38
15	Mildenhall Rd North	90	2	12	76
16	Bayview Wood, St. Aubyns Cres, Wood Ave	96	8	22	66
17	Fidelia Ave, St. Leonards Cres, Dawlish Ave	70	6	26	38
	Total Number of Trees	1201	106	247	848

Table 1 - Estimated Tree Impacts Based on Road Improvements



Figure A - Urban Cross Sections

Appendix A-12: Letter Issued After PIC #3



John Livey Deputy City Manager Annalisa Mignardi Director, Program Support

Policy, Planning, Finance & Administration Metro Hall, 19th Floor Toronto, Ontario M5H 2N2 Reply to:Tracy ManolakakisManager, Public Consultation UnitTel:416-392-2990Fax:416-392-2974E-mail:tmanola@toronto.ca

June 22, 2015

Dear Lawrence Park Residents:

We have received numerous emails, letters and phone calls expressing concerns about the city removing trees for road, sewer and sidewalk work in Lawrence Park.

We want to assure you that the city will not be removing any trees in the immediate future and has not finalized any plans for road, sewer or sidewalk construction.

In early 2013, the city initiated a study to address road conditions, traffic problems, pedestrian safety, road drainage and basement flooding in Lawrence Park.

Many Lawrence Park roads, sewers and drainage systems were constructed over 50 years ago, have reached the end of their service life and require replacement. Basement flooding is a problem, particularly given the increasing number of extreme weather events, and traffic and pedestrian safety issues exist.

A questionnaire was sent to every home in the study area in January 2013. We requested feedback on traffic conditions, unsafe intersections/streets, opportunities to improve local roads and experiences of basement flooding.

In mid-May 2015, the City held four public meetings to present and discuss preliminary recommendations to address the problems outlined above (deteriorating road conditions, traffic, pedestrian safety, road drainage and basement flooding). Invitations were mailed via Canada Post to every home in the study area. As well, the information presented at the meetings was posted on our website in advance of the meetings.

The preliminary recommendations are street specific and can be found on our website. **They are not final recommendations.**

Recently, concerned residents have tied yellow tape around city-owned trees based on information discussed at the May 2015 public meetings. It is important to note that this information is an estimate for planning purposes only and is not final.

In fact, we are committed to limiting any and all impacts to the neighbourhood, something we have successfully done in similar projects across the city.

City staff will make every effort to minimize the removal of trees. Measures that have been used successfully on similar projects include:

- Shifting the road horizontally to lessen the impact on trees;
- Localized narrowing of the road;
- Using alternative construction techniques (i.e. hand digging and root protection to preserve root structure);
- Using alternative materials to reduce tree loss; and,
- Applying various treatments to maintain tree health in advance of construction (i.e. crown and root pruning, fertilization and irrigation).

Over the next few months, city staff will review all comments and take a second look at the preliminary recommendations.

We have met with Councillor Jaye Robinson and, at her request, we will come back to the community for further consultation in the Fall once we have completed our review and considered all of your comments and feedback.

We would like to assure you that the neighbourhood will be advised of final recommendations and be provided with additional opportunities for input.

If you are interested in finding out more about our study, please visit <u>www.toronto.ca/lawrencepark</u>.

Sincerely,

Tracy Manolakakis Manager, Public Consultation Unit City of Toronto Appendix A-13: Letter to Lawrence Park Ratepayer Association – Arborist Report



John Livey Deputy City Manager Policy, Planning, Finance & Administration Metro Hall, 19th Floor Toronto, Ontario M5H 2N2 Reply to: Tracy Manolakakis Manager, Public Consultation Unit **Tel:** 416-392-2990 **Fax:** 416-392-2974 **E-mail:** tracy.manolakakis@toronto.ca

September 18, 2017

Valentine Lovekin Lawrence Park Ratepayers' Association P.O.Box 239, 3219 Yonge Street Toronto, Ontario M4N 3S1 and Jose Rubio Lazo 446 Davisville Avenue Toronto, ON M4S 1H8

Dear Mr. Lovekin and Mr. Lazo,

The City has reviewed a copy of the executive summary report commissioned by the Lawrence Park Ratepayers' Association and prepared by Mr. Lazo, dated July 14, 2016. We would like to take this opportunity to provide clarification about our study approach and address the statements and recommendations outlined in your report.

Study Background

The Lawrence Park Neighbourhood Investigation of Basement Flooding (Area 20) & Road Improvement Study seeks to address problems associated with basement flooding, deteriorated road infrastructure, poor road drainage, pedestrian safety and traffic. The study has been undertaken in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) requirements as set out by the Municipal Engineers Association.

As with any EA study, we have evaluated a reasonable set of alternative solutions to address the infrastructure problems noted above and used a set of criteria to assess not only the impact on urban green space (street trees) but also factors such as pedestrian safety, accessibility for maintenance and emergency vehicles, pedestrian connectivity and capital costs. It is important to note that as part of an EA study, the impact on urban green space is typically assessed at a high level through a desktop exercise. During a study, the tree impacts are only an estimate and used for the purpose of comparing each of the alternative solutions and selecting a recommended alternative.

The City and its consultants undertook a more detailed review of tree impacts for all the alternatives considered and further review for the recommended solution than is typical of EA studies. This was done to better define and minimize the impacts. It is only at the later phases (i.e., detailed design and construction) following completion of the study itself that an accurate account of the tree impacts can be provided.

Our Approach to Assessing the Tree Impacts

At the onset of our study, an inventory of tree data was collected. This data was used to determine the impacts to trees for each of the alternative solutions. On streets requiring reconstruction, the tree impact assessment exercise included figures which formed the basis for information that was presented at public consultation meetings in May 2015.

Based on a review of the public comments received following the meetings, staff worked with Urban Forestry and our engineering consultants to reassess the impacts on street trees for the recommended solutions.

In our assessments, the study team examined the type, size, species and location of each tree relative to the excavation/construction width. Bear in mind, that the excavation/construction width that has been used is a very preliminary and will be further defined during detailed design with consideration of factors such as utility conflicts, construction techniques and the opportunities to narrow the road width and shift the road alignments.

At the public consultation meeting held on May 26, 2016, we used the term -Tree Impact Zone (TIZ) to explain our assessments. The TIZ is not intended to replace the term Tree Protection Zone, which is referred to in the City's Tree Protection Policy and Specifications for Construction Near Trees guideline. The TIZ is the perimeter for each tree as determined through a field inspection, whereby we gave consideration to the tree species, size and location of each tree to qualify the impact of construction such that a meaningful assessment could be communicated to the public, and is specific to our study.

As we outlined in our presentation to the public on May 26, 2016, there were three categories in which trees were placed based on the TIZ specific to each tree relative to the excavation/construction width required to reconstruct the road. The three categories are outlined below and illustrated in the drawing.

5885	Not Impacted: The Tree Impact Zone lies completely outside of the construction width and will not be impacted.
5885 •	Preserved if Possible: Construction inside the Tree Impact Zone; the tree will be impacted by construction. Design, construction and post construction mitigation techniques will be used to preserve the tree.
X	Removed and Replaced: Construction significantly inside the Tree Impact Zone. Tree significantly impacted by construction to the extent that removal is expected.



Both categories of preserved, if possible and removed/replaced are early estimates in our work. The City must still undertake detailed designs to factor in measures such as narrowing or shifting the road for tree protection.

In your report, you identify that the plan diagrams do not accurately reflect relative tree sizes or locations. Tree size (i.e., diametre at breast height (DBH) and crown reserve) were assessed according to standard arboricultural practices; DBH was measured using a tree caliper or diametre tape 1.4 m above grade, and crown reserve was measured at intervals of 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, or 15 metres. These measurements reflect observations made on site at the time of survey. Tree locations were surveyed by Aboud & Associates using a Trimble GeoXH and a TruPlulse 360B Laser Rangefinder.

Tree Assessment Terminology

With respect to comments about the use of unaccepted terms for tree condition, please note that there is no standard set by the City's Urban Forestry or established by the arboricultural industry. The City's Private Tree By-law (Chapter 813, Article III) only references trees that are healthy, poor and imminently hazardous and does not stipulate terms to be used.

Our consultant retained Aboud & Associates to complete an arborist report for the purposes of collecting tree data. Aboud & Associates are recognized in the arboricultural field and had ISA Certified Arborists conduct the inventory. In their report, they have used the terms "high", "mod/high", "moderate" and "low" to describe preservation priority rankings based on an assessment of tree size, biological health, and structural condition. The rankings are defined as follows:

High	Mature (DBH 50 cm or greater), healthy and in good overall condition.
Mod/High	Immature to established (up to 49 cm DBH). Generally healthy and with good form; or, somewhat compromised in health and form but providing a significant benefit to the neighbourhood (i.e., large canopy, and some maintenance could improve health and/or form).
Moderate	No size limit. The tree has clear indications of biological stress and/or structural deficiencies, which are unlikely to improve through maintenance.
Low	No size limit. Biological health and/or structural condition are greatly compromised such that removal would be recommended regardless of potential construction impacts. Size is small to large.

The following table presents the criteria and levels for each preservation priority ranking:

Preservation Priority Ranking	DBH	Biological Health	Condition
High	50 cm and	"H" only	"H" only
	greater		
ModHigh	< 50 cm	"H" – "H(M)"	"H" – "H(M)"
Moderate	Any	"H(M)" – "M"	"H(M)" – "M"
Low	Any	"M(L)" – "L"	"M(L)" – "L"

4

Preserving the Tree Canopy

In your report, you identify that there is an opportunity to preserve additional canopy through the reduction of the number of sidewalks. I would like to draw to your attention back to the study purpose, which includes the need to address pedestrian safety and problems associated with a lack of west-east connections within the neigbourhood, vehicle and pedestrian conflicts and lack of separation from traffic along Mildenhall Road (where a 1.2 metre asphalt path currently exists).

Removing sidewalks from areas 1, 5, 7 and 8 conflicts with the evaluation of alternatives recommended for these streets when considering the above mentioned criteria.

If we were to replace the existing infrastructure in its same place, the construction width would be wider and the tree impacts greater. Furthermore, we have been clear to state that there will be narrowing (down to 6.6 m) or shifting of the road to help in the protection of trees but this cannot be factored in until detailed design and will allow for a further reduction in tree removals.

Throughout our study, we have identified that tree protection measures will be a key feature of overall strategy in minimizing potential impacts to street trees, including a tree protection plan to be submitted and approved by Urban Forestry staff. As communicated in our presentation on May 26, the City is preparing a Best Management Practices document that will outline the measures we referenced and others to be implemented to minimize potential impacts to street trees during the design, construction and post construction phases of work. In addition, the City will plant a new tree for any tree that requires removal.

We welcome the Lawrence Park community's commitment to act as a steward in the protection of trees. As we have mentioned, we are interested in working with property owners to find planting opportunities ahead construction to allow trees to take seed and mature.

City's Responsibility for Protection of Trees

The City's Strategic Forest Management Plan (SFMP) has been considered in the development of our study work. The SFMP outlines numerous goals and challenges and must be read in concert with the City's Official Plan, which attempts to strike a balance between social, economic and natural heritage priorities within the City.

Lastly, we have worked closely with our Urban Forestry staff, whose responsibility it is to maintain and protect the approximately 600,000 City owned street trees under the Toronto Municipal Code – Chapter 813. The City takes great pride in its responsibility to ensure the protection and growth of the tree canopy.

We will continue to work closely with Urban Forestry staff and remain committed to engaging the local community in the detailed work to come. If you have any questions, I can be reached at 416-392-2990 or tmanola@toronto.ca.

Sincerely,

Tracy Manolakakis Manager, Public Consultation Unit City of Toronto

c. Grace Tesa, Engineering & Construction Services

Appendix A-14: Letters to Property Owners Impacted by Proposed Works on Private Property



Engineering & Construction Services

Metro Hall 55 John Street 20th Floor Toronto, Ontario M5H 2N2 John P. Kelly, P. Eng. Director, Design & Construction Linear Underground Infrastructure

Saleem Khan, P. Eng. Acting Manager, Basement Flooding Protection Program Tel: 416.397.5120 Fax: 416.392.5418 Email: saleem.khan@toronto.ca www.toronto.ca

November 28, 2016

Gord Mickovski Executive Director, Facilities & Operations Toronto French School 306 Lawrence Avenue East Toronto, ON M4N 1T7 Email: <u>GMickovski@tfs.ca</u>

Subject: Lawrence Park Neighbourhood Investigation of Basement Flooding and Road Improvement Study – Property Impacts

Dear Mr. Mickovski,

The City of Toronto has undertaken a study to address problems associated with basement flooding, deteriorated road infrastructure, poor road drainage, pedestrian safety and traffic within the Lawrence Park neighbourhood. The study has been undertaken in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) requirements as set out by the Municipal Engineers Association.

Our study recommends storm sewers on roads to be reconstructed, with the purpose of draining water from the surface and discharging into a nearby water course.

Potential Impacts to Your Property

You are receiving this letter because your property at 101 Mildenhall Road is impacted by this study recommendation. We are proposing the replacement of an existing 450 mm (diameter) storm sewer on your property with a larger pipe to help convey stormwater to the West Don River (see Figure 1 attached).

There is an existing storm sewer that runs along the north side of your property into ravine lands and discharges to an outfall along the West Don River. An easement agreement (No. NY140532) on title allows the City to enter these lands for the purposes of laying down and constructing a storm sewer outlet and keeping and maintaining it at all times in good condition and repair.

We are recommending that the existing storm sewer be replaced along the same alignment with an upgraded pipe which results in the sewer system conveying storm flows up to and including the 100 year storm. The final alignment, construction methods and timing will be confirmed during the detailed engineering design stage.



DI TORONTO

The City has completed a vegetation assessment for the affected lands. The assessment identifies a mature sugar maple forest on the valley slopes, and mature hemlock forest and cultural communities within the valley and floodplain of the West Don River. A revegetation/restoration plan will be developed at the detailed design stage in consultation with you, Urban Forestry and the Toronto & Region Conservation Authority.

Property Acquisition Process

Our Real Estate Services Division is responsible for acquiring an easement through your property. In acquiring easements, the City strives to balance municipal and community needs with the rights of the individual property owners. The focus is on negotiating mutually acceptable purchase agreements for the required easement. The City will obtain an appraisal, survey and other propertyrelated assessments, which will be used as the basis for discussing the terms and conditions with you once the necessary project approvals are in place.

Next Steps

At this stage of the study, affected property owners are notified and consulted on the future need to acquire easements to advance the study recommendations. Once City Council has approved funding for a particular project, the City will then enter into formal negotiations with affected property owners. The timing for this is not yet known and no negotiations will occur at this time.

Construction timing depends on availability of funding from City Council, completion of the engineering design, easement acquisitions and obtaining all required planning approvals/permits. Once funding is approved, the earliest construction could begin is approximately five years from the conclusion of this study.

Meeting Request

We invite you to meet with us to discuss the study, its property impacts and next steps in the project approvals and the property acquisition process. We can arrange an in-person meeting or speak via phone or email. Please contact Tracy Manolakakis, Manager of Public Consultation who can be reached by telephone at 416-392-2990 or by e-mail at tracy.manolakakis@toronto.ca.

Sincerely,

50

Saleem Khan, P. Eng. Acting Manager, Basement Flooding & Protection Program Design & Construction, Linear Underground Infrastructure

Copy: Grace Tesa, City of Toronto

Attachment: Figure 1


Proposed Storm Sewer Upgrade at 101 Mildenhall Road

Existing 450 mm diameter sewer to be replaced with larger storm sewer

Toronto French School 101 Mildenhall Road





Engineering & Construction Services

Metro Hall 55 John Street 20th Floor Toronto, Ontario M5H 2N2 John P. Kelly, P. Eng. Director, Design & Construction Linear Underground Infrastructure

Saleem Khan, P. Eng. Acting Manager, Basement Flooding Protection Program Tel: 416.397.5120 Fax: 416.392.5418 Email: saleem.khan@toronto.ca www.toronto.ca

November 28, 2016

Weston Robinson Supervisor, Glendon Facilities Services York University 145 Jean-Jacques-Lussier Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5 Email: westonr@yorku.ca

Subject: Lawrence Park Neighbourhood Investigation of Basement Flooding and Road Improvement Study – Property Impacts

Dear Mr. Robinson,

The City of Toronto has undertaken a study to address problems associated with basement flooding, deteriorated road infrastructure, poor road drainage, pedestrian safety and traffic within the Lawrence Park neighbourhood. The study has been undertaken in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) requirements as set out by the Municipal Engineers Association.

Our study recommends storm sewers on roads to be reconstructed, with the purpose of draining water from the surface and discharging into a nearby water course.

Potential Impacts to Your Property

You are receiving this letter because your property at 2275 Bayview Avenue may be impacted by this study recommendation. We are proposing the replacement of the current 1350 mm diameter storm sewer on your property with a larger pipe and replacement of the existing 1200 mm storm sewer in the ravine area of your property with a pipe of similar size to help convey stormwater to the West Don River (see Figure 1 attached).

We are recommending that the existing storm sewers be replaced along the same alignment which results in the sewer system conveying storm flows up to and including the 100 year storm. The final alignment, construction methods and timing will be confirmed during the detailed engineering design stage.

The City has completed a vegetation assessment for the affected lands. The report identifies a maple forest on valley slopes and cultural woodland communities along the top of slope areas.



DA TORONTO

A revegetation/restoration plan will be developed at the detailed design stage in consultation with you, Urban Forestry and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. Given that there are existing cleared areas along the sewer line and at potential site access/staging areas, it is anticipated that vegetation removals will be minimal.

Property Acquisition Process

Our Real Estate Services Division is responsible for acquiring an easement through your property. In acquiring easements, the City strives to balance municipal and community needs with the rights of the individual property owners. The focus is on negotiating mutually acceptable purchase agreements for the required easement. The City will obtain an appraisal, survey and other propertyrelated assessments, which will be used as the basis for discussing the terms and conditions with you once the necessary project approvals are in place.

Next Steps

At this stage of the study, affected property owners are notified and consulted on the future need to acquire easements to advance the study recommendations. Once City Council has approved funding for a particular project, the City will then enter into formal negotiations with affected property owners. The timing for this is not yet known and no negotiations will occur at this time.

Construction timing depends on availability of funding from City Council, completion of the engineering design, easement acquisitions and obtaining all required planning approvals/permits. Once funding is approved, the earliest construction could begin is approximately five years from the conclusion of this study.

Meeting Request

We invite you to meet with us to discuss the study, its property impacts and next steps in the project approvals and the property acquisition process. We can arrange an in-person meeting or speak via phone or email. Please contact Tracy Manolakakis, Manager of Public Consultation who can be reached by telephone at 416-392-2990 or by e-mail at tracy.manolakakis@toronto.ca.

Sincerely,

007

Saleem Khan, P. Eng. Acting Manager, Basement Flooding & Protection Program Design & Construction, Linear Underground Infrastructure

Copy: Grace Tesa, City of Toronto

Attachment: Figure 1



Proposed Storm Sewer Upgrade at York University Glendon College Campus 2275 Bayview Avenue

Existing 1200 mm storm sewer to be replaced (deepened) with a similar size storm sewer

Vest Don River

York University 2275 Bayview Avenue

Existing 1350 mm storm sewer to be replaced with a larger storm sewer





Engineering & Construction Services

Metro Hall 55 John Street 20th Floor Toronto, Ontario M5H 2N2 John P. Kelly, P. Eng. Director, Design & Construction Linear Underground Infrastructure

Saleem Khan, P. Eng. Acting Manager, Basement Flooding Protection Program Tel: 416.397.5120 Fax: 416.392.5418 Email: saleem.khan@toronto.ca www.toronto.ca

November 28, 2016

The Governing Council of the University of Toronto c/o Ms. Sheree Drummond 21 Sussex Ave Toronto, ON M5S 1J6 Email: <u>sheree.drummond@utoronto.ca</u>

Subject: Lawrence Park Neighbourhood Investigation of Basement Flooding and Road Improvement Study – Property Impacts

Dear Ms. Drummond,

The City of Toronto has undertaken a study to address problems associated with basement flooding, deteriorated road infrastructure, poor road drainage, pedestrian safety and traffic within the Lawrence Park neighbourhood. The study has been undertaken in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) requirements as set out by the Municipal Engineers Association.

Our study recommends the installation of new sanitary sewers to provide additional capacity in our sewer system to help reduce the risk of basement flooding.

Potential Impacts to Your Property

You are receiving this letter because your property at 2075 Bayview Ave is impacted by this study recommendation. We are proposing the replacement of an existing sanitary sewer which is located adjacent to the northern edge of your property, along the southern edge of 28 Valleyanna Drive with a new sanitary sewer along the same alignment (see Figure 1 attached).

The sanitary sewer will convey wastewater flows from lands located along Valleyanna Drive as well as areas west of Bayview Avenue to the West Don Sanitary Trunk Sewer located near the West Don River. The final alignment, construction methods and timing will be confirmed after this Study and during the detailed design stage.

The City has completed a vegetation assessment for the affected lands. The report identifies a cultural woodland along the top of slope areas of the West Don River valley. A revegetation/restoration plan will be developed at the detailed design stage in consultation with you, Urban Forestry and the Toronto & Region Conservation Authority, as required.



DA TORONTO

Property Acquisition Process

Our Real Estate Services Division is responsible for acquiring an easement through your property. In acquiring easements, the City strives to balance municipal and community needs with the rights of the individual property owners. The focus is on negotiating mutually acceptable purchase agreements for the required easement. The City will obtain an appraisal, survey and other propertyrelated assessments, which will be used as the basis for discussing the terms and conditions with you once the necessary project approvals are in place.

Next Steps

At this stage of the study, affected property owners are notified and consulted on the future need to acquire easements to advance the study recommendations. Once City Council has approved funding for a particular project, the City will then enter into formal negotiations with affected property owners. The timing for this is not yet known and no negotiations will occur at this time.

Construction timing depends on availability of funding from City Council, completion of the engineering design, easement acquisitions and obtaining all required planning approvals/permits. Once funding is approved, the earliest construction could begin is approximately five years from the conclusion of this study.

Meeting Request

We invite you to meet with us to discuss the study, its property impacts and next steps in the project approvals and the property acquisition process. We can arrange an in-person meeting or speak via phone or email. Please contact Tracy Manolakakis, Manager of Public Consultation who can be reached by telephone at 416-392-2990 or by e-mail at tracy.manolakakis@toronto.ca.

Sincerely,

20-

Saleem Khan, P. Eng. Acting Manager, Basement Flooding & Protection Program Design & Construction, Linear Underground Infrastructure

Copy: Grace Tesa, City of Toronto

Attachment: Figure 1



Proposed Sanitary Sewer Upgrade at 28 Valleyana Drive

28 Valleyanna Drive

Existing 250 mm diameter Sanitary Sewer to be replaced (deepened) to accomodate proposed upstream sanitary sewer works





Engineering & Construction Services

Metro Hall 55 John Street 20th Floor Toronto, Ontario M5H 2N2 John P. Kelly, P. Eng. Director, Design & Construction Linear Underground Infrastructure

Saleem Khan, P. Eng. Acting Manager, Basement Flooding Protection Program Tel: 416.397.5120 Fax: 416.392.5418 Email: saleem.khan@toronto.ca www.toronto.ca

November 28, 2016

Yang Jun 290 Holmes Ave Toronto, ON M2N 4N3

Subject: Lawrence Park Neighbourhood Investigation of Basement Flooding and Road Improvement Study – Property Impacts

Dear Mr. Jun,

The City of Toronto has undertaken a study to address problems associated with basement flooding, deteriorated road infrastructure, poor road drainage, pedestrian safety and traffic within the Lawrence Park neighbourhood. The study has been undertaken in accordance with the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) requirements as set out by the Municipal Engineers Association.

Our study recommends the installation of new sanitary sewers to provide additional capacity in our sewer system to help reduce the risk of basement flooding.

Potential Impacts to Your Property

You are receiving this letter because your property at 28 Valleyanna Drive is impacted by this study recommendation. We are proposing the replacement of the existing sanitary sewer located along the southern edge of your property with a new sanitary sewer along the same alignment (see Figure 1 attached).

The sanitary sewer will convey wastewater flows from lands located along Valleyanna Drive as well as areas west of Bayview Avenue to the West Don Sanitary Trunk Sewer located near the West Don River. The final alignment, construction methods and timing will be confirmed after this Study and during the detailed design stage.

The City has completed a vegetation assessment for the affected lands. The report identifies a cultural woodland along the top of slope areas of the West Don River valley. A revegetation/restoration plan will be developed at the detailed design stage in consultation with you, Urban Forestry and the Toronto & Region Conservation Authority, as required.



DA TORONTO

Property Acquisition Process

Our Real Estate Services Division is responsible for acquiring an easement through your property. In acquiring easements, the City strives to balance municipal and community needs with the rights of the individual property owners. The focus is on negotiating mutually acceptable purchase agreements for the required easement. The City will obtain an appraisal, survey and other propertyrelated assessments, which will be used as the basis for discussing the terms and conditions with you once the necessary project approvals are in place.

Next Steps

At this stage of the study, affected property owners are notified and consulted on the future need to acquire easements to advance the study recommendations. Once City Council has approved funding for a particular project, the City will then enter into formal negotiations with affected property owners. The timing for this is not yet known and no negotiations will occur at this time.

Construction timing depends on availability of funding from City Council, completion of the engineering design, easement acquisitions and obtaining all required planning approvals/permits. Once funding is approved, the earliest construction could begin is approximately five years from the conclusion of this study.

Meeting Request

We invite you to meet with us to discuss the study, its property impacts and next steps in the project approvals and the property acquisition process. We can arrange an in-person meeting or speak via phone or email. Please contact Tracy Manolakakis, Manager of Public Consultation who can be reached by telephone at 416-392-2990 or by e-mail at tracy.manolakakis@toronto.ca.

Sincerely,

>0-

Saleem Khan, P. Eng. Acting Manager, Basement Flooding & Protection Program Design & Construction, Linear Underground Infrastructure

Copy: Grace Tesa, City of Toronto

Attachment: Figure 1



Proposed Sanitary Sewer Upgrade at 28 Valleyana Drive

28 Valleyanna Drive

Existing 250 mm diameter Sanitary Sewer to be replaced (deepened) to accomodate proposed upstream sanitary sewer works



Appendix A-15: Letters to Property Owners Impacted by Proposed Works in the RoW



Transportation Services Stephen Buckley, General Manager North York Civic Centre 5100 Yonge St 4th floor Toronto ON M2N 5V7 Jacqueline White, P. Eng Director <u>Transportation Services North York District</u> Tel: 416-395-7463 Fax: 416-395-7544 Email: sdillon2@toronto.ca

March 17, 2015

REGISTERED MAIL RW 653 415 765 CA

Puica Nitu 5 Strathgowan Crescent Toronto, Ontario M4N 2Z6

Dear Sir or Madam:

Re: Lawrence Park Environmental Assessment - Retaining Wall Modification

The City of Toronto has initiated a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) study in the Lawrence Park neighbourhood to address issues related to deteriorating road conditions, traffic and pedestrian safety, drainage problems and basement flooding.

It has been identified through the Municipal Class EA process that the retaining wall located on the northeast corner of the intersection creates a sight obstruction for motorists and obstructs southbound motorist's view of westbound motorists on Blythwood Road. As such, the City of Toronto will be undertaking detailed assessments to determine the feasibility of relocating the retaining wall and hedge to a more suitable location.

It should also be noted that all costs associated with the relocation of the retaining wall and hedge will be absorbed by the City of Toronto as part of the Municipal Class EA.

Please respond to Sidra Rahimzada, Acting Supervisor at 416-395-7466 with your acknowledgement of this notice. Should you fail to respond within 30 days of the date of this notice, it will be interpreted that you do not have any objections to the work being undertaken by the City of Toronto.

For inquires pertaining to the Municipal Class EA, please contact Tracy Manolakakis, Manager Public Consultation at 416-392-2990.

Sincerely,

Theme

Shawn Dillon Manager, Traffic Operations

SR\wb

cc: Gilbert Yu, Acting Supervisor, Right-of-Way Management

G:\tra\NYtrans\DATA\INVESTIG\2014-2015\Neighbourhood Issues\SightLineObstruction(TI-NGHB12)\2015\5 Strathgowar



Appendix A-16: Minutes of Meetings with Property Owners Impacted by Proposed Works on Private Property

Subject Lawrence Park Neighbourhood Investigation of Basement Flooding & Road Improvement Environmental Assessment Study (9117-12-7049)

Date & Time	Tuesday, December 20, 2016
Location	Toronto French School
Attendees	Gord Micovski, TFS Tracy Manolakakis, Grace Tesa, City of Toronto Dave Maunder, Aquafor Beech Consulting Ltd.
Prepared by:	Tracy Manolakakis

Minutes

Item	Notes	Follow up
1	As part of the Lawrence Park Neighbourhood Investigation of Basement Flooding & Road Improvement Study, a 1200 millimetre (mm) storm sewer has been recommended to collect and transport road drainage to an outfall located in the West Don River. The sizing has been identified through preliminary analysis and may be revised before finalizing the Master Plan report. The sizing and alignment will be confirmed at the detailed design stage.	Information Only
	The recommended storm sewer is proposed to be routed along the north section of the study area and along TFS property to an outfall in the West Don River. An easement currently exists along TFS lands for a 450 mm storm sewer. The easement only grants the City rights of keeping and maintaining the storm sewer at all times in good condition and repair. The existing sewer would be abandoned and left in place.	Information Only
3	Dave M. indicated that the sewer would likely be constructed by the jack and bore method.	Information Only
4	Geotechnical work is required to confirm ground conditions and will be undertaken at the detailed design phase.	Information Only
5	Gord M. indicated that TFS will be issuing an RFP for the development of a Master Plan for the school property. This work is set to begin next year.	Gord M. to follow- up with City staff.
6	Gord M. will bring forward the study recommendation to the Board of Directors.	Gord M.
7	Slope at the northwest section of the property (behind Petit L'ecole) appears to be 22%. Erosion appeared along the slope. Options will be explored at the detailed design phase on how to undertake construction.	Information Only

	The sewer alignment is located within an area of the school where there are stairs leading to the river. The area also contains informal outdoor education spots and is actively used by the teaching staff and students. Any future work in the ravine lands should incorporate educational learning.	
8	It was identified that the City may require a temporary working and permanent easement to construct the proposed sewer. The permanent easement may include the area required for construction. This will be determined at the detailed design stage.	
9	City will be moving forward with a report to a Committee of City Council outlining the study recommendations. Information will be provided to Gord.	Tracy to follow-up with Gord once staff report is completed.

Note: The project is part of a Master Plan study that is underway. The study is expected to be completed in early Spring 2017. The proposed work is not yet funded. A detailed design for the storm sewer work is still required and the earliest start is expected to be 2020. The City remains committed to further discussions with the Toronto French School concerning the recommended work.



Subject	Lawrence Park Neighbourhood Investigation of Basement Flooding & Road Improvement Environmental Assessment Study (9117-12-7049)
Date & Time	Tuesday, January 24, 2016
Location	Glendon College, York University
Attendees	City of Toronto - Salem Khan, Man-Kit Koo, Tracy Manolakakis, Grace Tesa, Dave Maunder (Aquafor Beech Limited)
	York University – Gary Gazo, Brad Cochrane, Richard Francki, Chris Wong, Helen Psathas, Tony Manza, Blair Price, Mike Daigle
	Toronto Hydro – Boris Solano
Prepared by:	Tracy Manolakakis

Minutes

Item	Notes	Follow up
1	An overview of the study purpose and recommended solutions was provided by the city's consultant Dave Maunder. The City is at the planning stage, undertaking a municipal class environmental assessment study. Preliminary and detailed design are still to be carried out.	Copy attached.
2	The requirement for storm sewer system upgrades along the alignment of the existing storm sewer on Glendon College property is a result of the recommended road reconstruction works. Storm flows draining from reconstructed roads and properties in the central area of the study area will be carried by the proposed storm sewer on the Glendon College property to an existing outfall in the west branch of the Don River. Three other storm sewer system improvements are required at the north, west and south-eastern sections of the study area to carry road drainage and stormwater runoff to existing storm outfalls.	

3	The existing easement does not allow for replacement of the current sewer. A new easement agreement would be required for the new storm sewer that considers access requirements during construction and access requirements to permanently operate, maintain and repair the infrastructure. Easement requirements are based on City standards which consider the size and depth of the sewer, and proximity to adjacent sewers/watermains. The proposed storm sewer size and depth are finalized as part of the detailed engineering work and therefore the	
	determined. City staff have in the past considered existing easement widths in establishing new easement requirements and would be mutually agreed upon.	
4	The aerial map shown of Glendon College campus was out of date.	Reference date of map to be included in study documentation.
5	A drop shaft of up to 6 metres depth would be required at the location shown on Slide 14 (middle blue dot-manhole). The depth of the shaft would be determined at the detailed design stage.	
6	The existing City storm sewer that runs through the Glendon College campus consists of 1350 mm concrete pipe (first two sections from the south entrance), 1200 mm corrugated metal pipe (third and fourth sections) and 1050 mm corrugated metal pipe to the outfall. Recent inspections indicate the sewers were in relatively good condition, without any blockage.	
7	City would be required to replace any trees within the ravine at a ratio of 3 to 1.	
8	City staff met with Toronto & Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) to discuss the proposed work and to confirm TRCA requirements. TRCA is responsible for regulating flows to the Don River.	
	TRCA generally does not support the construction of new outfalls nor do they support diverting flows from an existing outlet to a new section of the watercourse.	
	York U has had to demonstrate a reduction in peak flow rate as part of their site plan approvals (i.e., post-to-pre control for all storms).	
	The City's Wet Weather Flow Management Policy is adhered to by the City in the design of the sewer system improvements. An infiltration pipe is proposed as part of the storm sewer system improvements.	

9	 The next steps in the study process include: Issuing a staff report seeking authority from a Committee of Council to file the Master Plan Report for a 30-day review period. This is expected in late February. If accepted, City staff will issue a Notice of Completion and file the Master Plan Report for a 30-day public review period. If issues are raised during the 30-day review period that cannot be resolved with the City, persons can make a request to the Minister of the Environment & Climate Change to invoke Part II of the Environmental Assessment Act. If Part II orders are received, Minister must make a decision to require an individual EA; place conditions on approval; deny the requests. Detailed design would take place following the above. The earliest expected date for design to begin is 2020. 	Tracy to send York U notice of the staff report and filing of the Master Plan Report for 30-day review period.
10	Detailed design phase would require further discussions with the university, Toronto & Region Conservation Authority, City's Urban Forestry section and other affected utilities.	
11	Further studies and investigations are required during detailed design stage, which include geotechnical investigations, survey, subsurface utility engineering (SUE), and tree inventory. York U can be contacted to provide information and consulted during the design development.	
12	City has not considered a special rate increase for property owners where infrastructure improvements are required. Project funding not yet secured and must be brought forward in future budget. Approx. construction and design cost is \$75 million for all works and would be funded partially through the water rate and property tax rate.	
13	Given the potential disruption to the Glendon College campus, York U would like to see a mutual benefit. Concerned that consulted at a late stage in the study.	
14	As a separate item, York U indicated that it provided the City a letter of credit as a condition of site plan approval for a segment of lands at the entrance, near the gates abutting Bayview Avenue for future road widening. York U would like an update on the status is this.	Tracy to follow-up with City Planning and Transportation staff.
15	A copy of the topographical survey was requested by York U.	Tracy to send copy of mapping included in the study report.
16	Gates at the entrance to the campus are designated a heritage feature and should not be impacted. Based on this and other features, such as mature trees, the City would examine the possibility of constructing the storm sewer by jack and bore method (tunnelling) at the detailed design stage.	

17	Questions arose about what other options were investigated. City staff clarified that the alternatives evaluated as part of the EA process were alternatives to address road, drainage and sidewalk issues – namely alternatives with rural or urban cross-sections, standard pavement widths, and 1, 2 or no sidewalk.	City staff to confirm feasibility of options for storm sewer improvements.
	The study recommendation is for an urban cross-section (addition of storm sewers) and the necessary storms sewer improvements were developed as a result. The proposed storm sewer system improvements presented were determined to be the most feasible works to convey drainage from the reconstructed roads and properties from the central part of the study area. At a very high level, the feasibility of providing in-line storage to avoid improvements through the Glendon College campus were investigated. Based on topography, pipe depth and potential conflicts with other utilities, no suitable location was identified for storage. Based upon a preliminary review of routing the storm sewer along Bayview north of Lawrence and may not be feasible due to the topography and depth of sewer. This option will be further examined.	Tracy to send a copy of the InfoWorks model.
	Storm sewer infrastructure on neighbouring condo property not shown on City's shapefile as it may be private infrastructure. Flows from these properties are included in the analysis. York U requested a copy of the InfoWorks model.	
18	York U is working with Toronto Hydro. Interest was expressed in routing conduit in a combined trench. The hydro work is required for immediate implementation.	City staff to assign a contact for YorkU and Hydro to follow-up with
	Since contractors working for the City have extensive experience working around underground utilities, and City standards address supporting underground utilities, there are no requirements for any special arrangements to be made by Toronto Hydro as part of their work.	on proposed work.

Subject Lawrence Park Neighbourhood Investigation of Basement Flooding & Road Improvement Environmental Assessment Study (9117-12-7049)

- Date & Time Thursday, February 16, 2016
- Location Keele Campus, York University
- Attendees Salem Khan, Man-Kit Koo, Tracy Manolakakis, Grace Tesa, City of Toronto Dave Maunder, Aquafor Beech Limited Brad Cochrane, Peter Winn, York University
- Prepared by: Tracy Manolakakis

Minutes

Item	Notes	Follow up
1	Meeting minutes from January 24th were reviewed. City provided an update on next steps. Staff report is expected to be presented at next meeting of Public Works & Infrastructure Committee on April 12. City will notify York U representative once date is confirmed.	
2	Tracy reviewed the approach to examining alternatives for the EA Study to address road drainage issues, which were examined as part of the road improvements. Two alternatives were examined for road drainage - urban cross-section and rural cross-section. The urban cross-section was selected as part of the preferred solution. The recommended storm sewer improvement through Glendon College is connected to the road drainage which provides conveyance of the flows to the existing outlet. The sewer improvement is not a stand-alone project as it is related and interdependent on the road improvements, hence why alternatives were not examined for the routing of storm flows. Based on comments from York University, the City has examined options to address their concerns.	

3	Tracy indicated that records showed that York U was notified of the study commencement in early 2013.	Tracy to send copy of email and notices.
4	 Dave reviewed the two options for routing of stormwater flows. Option 1 – new storm sewer would be constructed within Glendon College following a similar alignment to the existing sewers. Option 2 – new storm sewer would be routed along Bayview Avenue north of Lawrence Avenue to an existing right-of-way located on the east side and connected to the outfall 	Hard copies provided. Electronic copy to be emailed.
	Option 2A – utilize the capacity of the existing sewer within Glendon College and route a smaller sewer (than Option 2) along Bayview Avenue	
	Dave noted that an outlet along Valleyanna was not feasible due to grades and the proposed sanitary trunk sewer along Valleyanna.	
	Storage of flows was determined to be non-feasible due to the large volume required (approximately 4,000 m ³), the estimated cost (approximately \$6,000,000) and the lack of depth to provide underground storage.	
5	Brad requested a written summary outlining each option and providing costing and any constraints. Item will be reviewed with York U senior management.	Written outline to be issued in 2 weeks.
6	Peter asked what the reason was for the 100 year design standard.	
	Dave responded that the proposed sewer within Glendon College is the minimum size to meet City criteria for upstream lands (i.e., a smaller pipe would result in surcharging in the upstream sewer system).	
7	City performed a CCTV of the storm sewer in 2015. Storm sewer appeared to be in good condition.	Man-Kit to send copy of CCTV.
	York U interested in viewing copy of the CCTV and confirming connections.	
8	Brad identified that university is concerned about potential impact a back-up from storm sewer would have on Glendon College electrical substation.	
	City identified that overflow structures could be placed at locations and flows directed away from substation.	

9	Brad identified that they would like to see storm sewer routed to minimize impact on parking lot. He also noted that buses require turning radius at south end of parking lot and would need to be accommodated.	
10	City staff have reviewed the recommendations with TRCA and no concerns have been raised. TRCA will provide final comments and identify requirements for detailed design during the 30-day review period. City has worked with TRCA on similar projects throughout the City. York University concerned about effects on erosion near tennis courts and road/bridge leading to their parking lot. City staff indicated that any erosion issues and potential impacts to the infrastructure will be raised by TRCA and if necessary additional studies may be required by the City at the detailed design stage.	
11	Brad noted that there is geothermal system located at the Lawrence Park Community Church and the City should look at the impact the use of a perforated pipe system would have on the system based on changes to groundwater levels.	Tracy to follow-up with Church for details on their system.