



File Number: AFOB172

October 28, 2015

Mr. Jack Gibbons
North Gwillimbury Forest Alliance
160 John Street, Suite 300
Toronto M5V 2E5

Dear Mr. Gibbons:

Re: Request for Access to Information

Further to your email dated October 13, 2015, we have located the Terms of Reference documents, referenced on page 4 of the April 2015 Dillon Consulting Environmental Impact Statement.

The following records are attached for your information:

1. Internal LSRCA memorandum, dated April 3, 2013
2. External memorandum from Dillon Consulting, dated March 26, 2013
3. LSRCA letter to Dillon Consulting, dated January 27, 2012
4. External memorandum from Dillon Consulting, dated January 11, 2012

We trust this is satisfactory.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jocelyn Lee".

Jocelyn Lee, CPA, CMA
Freedom of Information Coordinator
General Manager, Corporate & Financial Services
/rsf

Attach - 4



Lake Simcoe
Region
Conservation
Authority

Interoffice Memo

Date: April 3, 2013
To: Charles Burgess
From: W. Yerex
Subject: Maple Lake Estates- Review of contents for EIS and Edge Management Plan
File No:

I have reviewed the information that was provided. I offer the following comments:

- Although there does not appear to be an agreed-upon Terms of Reference in the file, I will base my comments on the information that Dillon Consulting has provided
- In general, the Table of Contents covers the majority of the work required
- Specifically, there needs to be confirmation that the wetland is classified properly ie confirm it is PSW as per the OWES and that it's extent (delineation) is staked, and surveyed/mapped into any future development plans
- There is some discussion around 6.0 Mitigation and Opportunities For Enhancement that should consider that the LSRCA expects that the loss of wetland area will be replaced at a 3:1 ratio (ie 3 Ha replacement for 1 Ha lost) or some other innovative means of mitigating for those losses
- A description of the protocols that will be used in sampling vegetation, amphibians, birds, etc needs to be provided as part of this document, so expectations are understood.

Please let me know if further information is required.

Warren

MEMO



TO: Mike Walters, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority
Rob Baldwin, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority
Charles Burgess, Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority

FROM: Allen Benson, Dillon Consulting Limited

CC: Tom Albani, Metrus Development Inc.

DATE: Tuesday, March 26, 2013

SUBJECT: Maple Lake Estates Environmental Impact Study and Edge Management Plan Table of Contents for LSRCA Review

OUR FILE: 092238

Dear Mr. Walters:

As requested during our meeting on Wednesday, March 20, 2013, Dillon has prepared a Table of Contents for the upcoming submissions of an Environmental Impact Study and Edge Management Plan for the Metrus Maple Lake Estates project in Georgina. The Table of Contents reflects past correspondence, including an agreed-upon Terms of Reference established in January, 2012.

Proposed Table of Contents for Environmental Impact Study

- 1.0 INTRODUCTION
- 2.0 PLANNING CONTEXT
 - 2.1 General
 - 2.2 Provincial Policy Statement
 - 2.3 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe
 - 2.4 Greenbelt Plan, 2005
 - 2.5 Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, 2009
 - 2.6 Ontario Regulation 179/06
 - 2.7 Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority Watershed Development Policies, 1984
 - 2.8 York Region Official Plan, 2010
 - 2.9 Town of Georgina Official Plan, 2010
 - 2.10 Species of Conservation Interest: Species at Risk
 - 2.11 Analysis of Significance and Sensitivity
- 3.0 METHODOLOGY OF BIOPHYSICAL INVENTORY
 - 3.1 Historical Air Photo Interpretation
 - 3.2 Vegetation
 - 3.3 Ecological land Classification
 - 3.4 Wetland Boundary Delineation

Looks good!

*cont. in attachment as a PSW
wetland classification
OWES*

- 3.5 Breeding Bird Survey
- 3.6 Amphibian Survey
- 3.7 Wildlife Observations
- 3.8 Endangered, Rare and Threatened Species

- 4.0 RESULTS – BIOPHYSICAL INVENTORY
 - 4.1 General
 - 4.2 Historical Air Photo Interpretation
 - 4.3 Landform, Geological and Topographical Features
 - 4.4 Vegetation
 - 4.5 Ecological Land Classification
 - 4.6 Wetland Boundary Delineation + Classification
 - 4.7 Breeding Bird Survey *OWES*
 - 4.8 Amphibian Survey
 - 4.9 Incidental Wildlife Observations
 - 4.10 Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Species
 - 4.11 Agency-Designated Environmental Features
 - 4.12 Limit of Development
 - 4.13 Ecological Function
 - 4.13.1 Connectivity of Natural Features
 - 4.13.2 Interior Forest Habitat
 - 4.13.3 Swamp Hydrology and Ecology
 - 4.13.4 Drainage Features

- 5.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT
 - 5.1 Direct Impacts
 - 5.1.1 Swamp Fragmentation and Alteration of Hydrologic Regime
 - 5.1.2 Forest Fragmentation
 - 5.1.3 Tree and Vegetation Removal
 - 5.1.4 Sedimentation of Swamp and Woodland Areas
 - 5.1.5 Loss of Potential Wildlife Habitat
 - 5.2 Indirect Impacts
 - 5.2.1 Anthropogenic Disturbance
 - 5.2.2 Invasion of Exotic Species

- 6.0 MITIGATION AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENHANCEMENT
 - 6.1 Low Impact Development Techniques
 - 6.2 Corridor Conservation and Movement Strategy
 - 6.3 Wildlife Impact Mitigation During Construction
 - 6.4 Edge Management Plan Summary
 - 6.5 Restoration and Enhancement Plan
 - 6.6 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan
 - 6.7 Environmental Monitoring Plan
 - 6.8 Opportunities for Stewardship

- 7.0 SUMMARY

- 8.0 REFERENCES

Proposed Table of Contents for Edge Management Plan

- 1.0 INTRODUCTION
- 2.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS AND PROPOSED VEGETATION CLEARING
 - 2.1 Existing Forest Edge Conditions
 - 2.2 Proposed Vegetation Clearing to Establish the New Forest Edge
- 3.0 EDGE MANAGEMENT PLAN
 - 3.1 Potential Impacts of Development on Forest Edge
 - 3.2 Vegetation Clearing to Establish the Development Limit
 - 3.2.1 Timing and Site Preparation
 - 3.2.2 Butternut Assessment and Protection
 - 3.2.3 Clearing and Grubbing
 - 3.3 Earthworks and Home Construction
 - 3.3.1 Tree Protection Fencing
 - 3.3.2 Earthworks and Home Construction
 - 3.3.3 Ongoing Monitoring
 - 3.4 Post-Construction
 - 3.4.1 Edge Restoration Plan
 - 3.4.2 Restoration Monitoring
 - 3.4.3 Homeowner Stewardship Programming
- 4.0 EDGE MANAGEMENT PLAN SUMMARY AND SCHEDULE
- 5.0 REFERENCES

Please provide comments and/or revisions, if necessary, by April 1, 2013 to allow sufficient time to submit the reports to LSRCA the week April 8th, 2013. If you have any questions or concerns please contact us at 416-229-4646.

Sincerely,

Dillon Consulting Limited



**Lake Simcoe
Region
Conservation
Authority**

January 27, 2012

Your File: 09-2238

Allen Benson
Associate, Biologist
Dillon Consulting Limited
235 Yorkland Blvd, Suite 800
Toronto, Ontario
M2J 4V8

Dear Mr. Benson:

Subject: Draft Terms of Reference – Environmental Impact Study
19T-87055 (Maple Lake Estates) – Metrus Development Inc.
Town of Georgina, Region of York

Thank you for consulting with the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA) with regard to the draft Terms of Reference for the proposed Environmental Impact Study (EIS). We understand that an EIS will be prepared to support applications to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-Law and a related draft plan of subdivision.

The LSRCA has reviewed the draft Terms of Reference dated January 11, 2012 in the following planning context:

- ✓ Provincial Policy Statement
- ✓ Lake Simcoe Protection Plan
- ✓ Regional and local Official Plans
- ✓ Ontario Regulation 179/06
- ✓ Natural Heritage System for the Lake Simcoe Watershed (2007)

On this basis, we provide the following comments for your consideration.

1. The Terms should clearly identify that the primary purpose of the EIS is to maximize the protection of natural heritage features on the property through the revised development concept and applications. As you know, the majority of the property contains a provincially significant wetland and is governed by Ontario Regulation 179/06. As a result, the previously approved development footprint established through the registered plan of subdivision should not form the basis of the EIS and its outcome.

.../2



**Lake Simcoe
Region
Conservation
Authority**

2. As you may be aware, it is typical that provincially significant wetlands be staked by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) through the planning and development process. As a result, Section 2.1 should be amended by requiring that the wetland of provincial significance will be staked by the MNR.
3. Section 2.1 should be revised to include that the EIS will be prepared to the satisfaction of the LSRCA in addition to the Town and Region.
4. The subject property is designated "Towns and Villages" within the Provincial Greenbelt Area. On this basis, the notation referring to the Greenbelt Plan within Section 2.2 Existing Conditions should be revised to state that only the external connections policies of the Plan (3.2.5) would apply to this proposal as opposed to identifying that the property is exempt in its entirety.
5. The identification of vegetation communities using Ecological Land Classification should be undertaken in the field during the appropriate season(s). Section 2.2 should be amended accordingly to reflect this requirement.
6. Mitigation for impacts on the natural heritage features including appropriate compensatory measures (e.g. reforestation, wetland creation, stream rehabilitation) will be required as part of this planning and development process. On this basis, Section 2.4 should refer to this condition of approval.
7. As you know, the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) applies to any land use proposal under the *Planning Act*. As a result, Section 2.5 Conclusions should be amended by adding: "*Consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)*"
8. Section 4 should be amended by requiring a Woodland Preservation and Management Plan. As you know, this Plan would address matters such as edge management and timing restrictions related to harvestation and migratory birds.
9. As noted in #6 above, appropriate compensatory measures should be provided through this planning and development process. As a result, Section 4 should be amended by requiring a Tree Compensation Plan. We disagree with the notion that tree compensation is not required because removal will occur within the registered plan of subdivision. This view, in our opinion, is not adequate substantiation to refute the need for appropriate tree compensation.



**Lake Simcoe
Region
Conservation
Authority**

If you have any further questions or should you wish to meet with us to discuss these comments, please contact Charles Burgess, MCIP, RPP, or the undersigned.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rob Baldwin", followed by a horizontal line.

Rob Baldwin
Director, Planning and Development Services

/cfb

Copy: Town of Georgina, Velvet Ross
 Region of York, Mike Mallette
 Ministry of Natural Resources, Tom Farrell
 LSRCA, Mike Walters

MEMORANDUM



TO: Charles Burgess
Senior Planning Coordinator
Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority

FROM: Allen Benson, Dillon Consulting Limited

DATE: 11 January, 2011

SUBJECT: Environmental Impact Study – Terms of Reference for
Maple Lake Estates

OUR FILE: 09-2238 – Maple Lake Estates

1.0 Introduction

Dillon Consulting Limited (Dillon) has been retained by Metrus Development Inc. (Metrus) to undertake environmental studies for the Maple Lake Estates project. Metrus is a large land holder within the Region of York and the Town of Georgina (the Town), and it is their goal to complete the development approvals process for the Maple Lake Estates property. The subject property is a large parcel of land located south of Metro Road North, north of Deer Park Road, east of Varney Road and west of Woodbine Avenue. Maple Lake Estates is also an approved Registered Plan of Subdivision (65M-2903; 2-lot plan registered Aug. 18, 1992) with approved permissions through Official Plan policies (OPA No. 10 to previous Official Plan, now Section 3.20 of current Official Plan) and Zoning provisions (original amending By-law No. 911-87-431).

Metrus and its consultants have been working together with the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA) and the Town in order to achieve a comprehensive list of agreed requirements in order to move forward with the Maple Lake Estates development. Through this on-going consultation, it was agreed that an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) is required as part of the planning process, and as such a Terms of Reference (TOR) outlining the appropriate environmental studies and reporting details is required.

In keeping with the general policies of the LSRCA Terms of Reference: Environmental Impact Study, we have prepared the following TOR based on LSRCA's Terms of Reference for an Environmental Impact Study document and similar scoping exercises that we have previously completed with the LSRCA as well as the pre-consultation meeting(s) with the Town.

Below, we present the TOR in a check-list format to ensure that the required work and/or studies are known and agreed to prior to the commencement of work, to facilitate a cost-effective, streamlined and timely review process.

2.0 Terms of Reference

2.1 General Policies

- The EIS must be undertaken by a qualified professional in environmental or related sciences to the satisfaction of the Authority.
- A visit to the site may be required by the Authority prior to, during, or upon receipt of the EIS.
- The staking of regulated areas (i.e., wetlands, top of bank, etc.) and Natural Heritage System (NHS) features (i.e., woodlands, etc.) by the Authority may be required. Staking will generally occur between the end of May and the end of October. Any staking that occurs outside of this time may require a confirmatory visit between May and October.

Note: There is no discernable top of bank feature within the Maple Lake Estates property, and the regulated areas (i.e., wetlands) can be delineated through existing mapping. Therefore, staking of these features would not be required. LSRCA may request a staking exercise at a later time, if required.

2.2 Existing Conditions

- The existing conditions of the subject property must be clearly described and clearly mapped on aerial photographs.
- The description must include the zoning and all designations of all Official Plan(s) (OP) on the subject property. This includes any land use designations from other municipal planning documents, such as Secondary Plans.
- Land use designations from any other applicable planning documents (i.e., Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, Greenbelt Plan) must be clearly described and the limits identified in the mapping.

Note: As the Maple Lake Estates property is designated as "Towns and Villages", it is exempt from the policies of the Greenbelt Plan as per policy 3.4.2.1.

- The EIS shall identify the components of the NHS and their respective Levels. The boundaries of the NHS shall be confirmed in the field by the proponent, mapped on a figure in the report and approved by the Authority and the planning authority.
- All designated environmental features (i.e., the NHS or natural features identified in the OPs) must be identified in the mapping and described in the report. These features include provincial or regional Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSIs), Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs), etc.
- The vegetation communities must be identified using the Ecological Land Classification (ELC) system to vegetation type, where possible. The communities must be identified in the mapping, using the appropriate ELC codes, as well as described in the text. As a component of the ELC, a plant list must be included as an appendix. The list must include an analysis for

for the presence of federal, provincial, regional and/or watershed rare, threatened or endangered species. This should include information from the MNR district office and NHIC.

- A two-season (late spring/early summer; late summer/early fall) plant survey is required and must be included as an appendix. The list must include an analysis for the presence of federal, provincial, regional and/or watershed rare, threatened or endangered species. This should include information from the MNR district office and NHIC.
- The EIS requires a breeding bird survey. The survey must be conducted during the breeding bird season at an appropriate time of day in appropriate weather conditions and by a qualified professional. A minimum of two surveys are required and they must follow generally accepted scientific protocols, not necessarily atlassing methods. A list of the breeding birds is required as an appendix. The list must include an analysis for the presence of federal or provincial rare, threatened or endangered species. Watershed rarity status shall be determined in conjunction with the Conservation Authority.
- The EIS requires a breeding amphibian/reptile survey. The survey must be conducted during the breeding amphibian season and by a qualified professional. For calling amphibians a minimum of three surveys are required. These surveys must span the full amphibian breeding season to ensure that the peak periods of activity for early and late breeding species are accounted for. For non-calling amphibians, appropriate methodology must be used. A list of the breeding amphibians is required as an appendix. The list must include an analysis for the presence of federal, provincial, threatened or endangered species. Watershed rarity status shall be determined in conjunction with the Conservation Authority.
- A fisheries assessment shall be provided due to the presence of suitable fish habitat as identified in the NHS and confirmed on-site by the proponent. Existing data regarding fish species shall be obtained from LSRCA and/or the MNR and used for the fisheries assessment. The assessment shall include a description of watercourses or other fish habitat on and/or adjacent to the property (where site access is permitted). Fish habitat and/or stream assessments will be completed through the Detailed Stream Assessment protocol as developed by Dillon.

Note: No suitable fish habitat has been identified with the Maple Lake Estates property boundaries.

- The fisheries assessment will include community sampling through electrofishing and/or netting during the appropriate season, under a collection permit issued by the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Note: No suitable fish habitat has been identified with the Maple Lake Estates property boundaries.

- All incidental wildlife observed shall be reported on and listed in an appendix. The list must include an analysis for the presence of federal or provincial rare, threatened or endangered species. Watershed rarity status shall be determined in conjunction with the conservation authority.

- ☒ A functional assessment of the subject property describing the ecology of the natural heritage features and functions should be provided. This shall include a consideration of the hydrological requirements of natural heritage features, particularly wetlands.
- ☒ Where the NHS has identified a stream linkage or potential proximity linkage on or adjacent to the property, the EIS must identify the location, width and proposed vegetation composition of the linkage.
- ☒ Mapping (at a minimum) shall consist of the following:
 - a) All mapping must have a title, figure number, north arrow, legend and scale or scale bar.
 - b) A site location map that provides the regional or watershed context of the subject property.
 - c) The extent of the NHS and its components must be clearly demarcated on an air photo base.
 - d) The locations of all watercourses and waterbodies and an indication of their flow and thermal regimes.
 - e) Vegetation communities must be delineated and identified using ELC.
 - f) The location of any rare, threatened or endangered species and/or populations shall be identified.
 - g) The location of any important wildlife features (i.e., hibernacula, den, stick nest, etc.) shall be identified.

2.3 Assessment of Impacts

- ☒ The potential impacts to the features and functions of the NHS shall be identified and discussed.
- ☒ An assessment of the potential impact on wildlife at a local, watershed and provincial (if applicable) level shall be provided.
- ☒ In the case of Level 1 and Level 2 features (as confirmed through field studies), the EIS must demonstrate that there is no development or site alteration within the feature with the exception of uses as specified in the OP and/or prior approvals. The EIS must determine appropriate buffers from Level 1 and Level 2 features.
- ☒ In the case of Level 3 features, the EIS must demonstrate no net negative impacts on the natural features or ecological functions, which may involve the identification of buffers from Level 3 features and other mitigation measures.
- ☒ A description of the natural features proposed for removal shall be provided. The quantity of removal shall also be included.

- An assessment of the potential impact on the NHS, including any Linkage areas that have been identified shall also be included.

2.4 Recommendations and Mitigation Measures

- Avoidance of any NHS feature, regardless of its assigned Level, is the preferred approach to mitigation unless otherwise specified in the OP and/or prior approvals.
- Determine adequate buffers through the identification of the critical function and protection zones of the NHS.
- Where avoidance of a feature is not feasible or possible, mitigation approaches/techniques must be provided. These may include edge management plans, buffer plantings, fencing, low impact designs (LID), etc.
- In cases where a Linkage area has been identified on a property, the EIS must demonstrate how it will be integrated into the proposed development plan.
- Recommendations for Best Management Practices during construction should be provided. This may include silt fencing, tree protection, fencing, identification of timing or seasonal constraints to construction or restoration, etc.
- Mitigation for negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions (or to achieve no net negative impact) may include, at the discretion of the planning authority in conjunction with the Authority, approaches to replace lost areas or functions. If acceptable, replacement shall, to the extent possible, occur within the same subwatershed as the proposed development or site alteration. The appropriate amount of replacement will be determined through discussions with the Authority and the planning authority and will be agreed to by all parties in writing.

Note: Maple Lake Estates is an approved Registered Plan of Subdivision and as such impacts to natural features as a result of the Registered Plan have been previously considered and approved.

- If monitoring is required, the details of a monitoring program must be agreed to in writing by the Authority, planning authority and other parties.

2.5 Conclusions

The EIS must demonstrate the following:

- Conformity with the policies and requirements of the Town of Georgina and the Region of York Official Plans.
- Conformity with the policies and requirements of other applicable planning documents (i.e., ORMCP, Greenbelt Plan, etc.)

Note: As the Maple Lake Estates property is designated as "Towns and Villages", it is exempt from the policies of the Greenbelt Plan as per policy 3.4.2.1.

- Conformity with the requirements of the LSRCA for the Maple Lake Estates development.

3.0 Species at Risk

Should any Species at Risk (SAR) or their habitat be identified during EIS process and confirmed in the field, the MNR will be notified and we will address any SAR requirements as outlined in the *Endangered Species Act, 2007* under separate cover with MNR. The LSRCA will be informed of MNR approvals that are acquired.

4.0 Town of Georgina Pre-consultation Items

The following *Environmental Considerations* items are those that have not been described above but have been discussed with the Town during the pre-consultation process.

- A discussion regarding conformity with the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan (LSPP) will be provided in the EIS.
- General Vegetation Protection, Enhancement and Restoration Plans will be provided with the mitigations in the EIS, if and where warranted.
- A Natural Heritage Evaluation.

Note: The Natural Heritage Evaluation is a requirement under the Greenbelt Plan and as the Maple Lake Estates property is designated as "Towns and Villages", it is exempt from the policies of the Greenbelt Plan as per policy 3.4.2.1.

- A Tree Compensation Plan.

Note: A Tree Compensation Plan is not required as the tree removals will be contained within the approved Registered Plan of Subdivision area. Should tree removals be required outside of the area of the approved subdivision, a Tree Compensation Plan will be completed at that time.

- A Tree Inventory and Preservation Study/Arborist Report.

Note: A Tree Inventory and Preservation Study/Arborist Report is not required as the tree removals will be contained within the approved Registered Plan of Subdivision area. Should tree removals be required outside of the area of the approved subdivision, a Tree Inventory and Preservation Study/Arborist Report will be completed at that time.

- A Woodland Preservation and Management Plan.

Note: A Woodland Preservation and Management Plan is not required as the tree removals will be contained within the approved Registered Plan of Subdivision area. Should tree

removals be required outside of the area of the approved subdivision, a Woodland Preservation and Management Plan will be completed at that time.

We would to thank you for your time in establishing these Terms of Reference with us and look forward to working together with you on this and other projects as we move forward.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Yours sincerely,

Dillon Consulting Limited

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Benson', with a horizontal line underneath.

Allen Benson, B.Sc. (Hons), LEED AP
Associate
Project Manager