



MEETING MINUTES

Subject: ESA CMP Planning Process and the AODA Information Meeting

Date and Time: February 21, 2018 17:30 – 19:00

Location: Stevenson Hunt Room, Central Library, City of London

Our File: 18-7086

Attendees

Michael Dawthorne*	Accessibility Advisory Committee (AACAC)
Katrina Moser	Environmental & Ecological Planning Advisory Committee (EEPAC)
Dan Jones	Upper Thames River Conservation Authority (UTRCA)
Sandy Levin	MVHF ESA Adopt an ESA: Sherwood Forest / Orchard Park RPA
Chris Sheculski	Sunningdale West RPA
Dr. Rhonda Bathurst	Museum of Ontario Archaeology
Jack Blocker	Huron University College
Mady Hymowitz	Nature London
Alex Vanderkam	Thames Valley Trail Association (TVTA)
Renee Agathos	Sunningdale North Residents Association
Linda McDougall	City of London
Andrew Macpherson	City of London
James MacKay+	City of London
John Fleming	City of London
Karla Kolli	Dillon Consulting Limited
Jennifer Petruniak	Dillon Consulting Limited
Jonathan Harris	Dillon Consulting Limited

*indicates an alternative representative

+had to depart earlier than the meeting end

Regrets

Greg Thorn	Sherwood Forest / Orchard Park RPA
Elgin Austen	MVHF ESA Adopt an ESA: Friends of Medway Creek
Michael Lunau	Western University
Bruce West	Attawandaron Residents
John Levstik	Old Masonville Ratepayers
Keith Zerebecki	MVHF ESA Adopt an ESA: Sunningdale West Rate Payer Association (RPA)
Brenda McQuaid	Heritage London Foundation

The main purpose of this meeting was to further clarify the City of London's requirements to meet the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act* (AODA) within the Conservation Master Planning process. The meeting also reviewed three main concerns with the October 2017 MVHF ESA (south) CMP and how they were addressed before the final version of the CMP is submitted to the Planning and Environment Committee (PEC). The meeting format included presentation of information related to both AODA and

the MVHF ESA (south) CMP. Opportunities were provided throughout the presentation for participants to ask questions and discuss the material being presented.

The meeting started with Andrew Macpherson welcoming those in attendance. Andrew relayed that the meeting was also being held to notify Local Advisory Committee (LAC) members of major revisions to the CMP that had been made to the October 2017 version of the CMP in response to comments received from committees of Council. It had been previously promised that if significant changes to the version to be submitted to PEC were made, the City would report back to the LAC first.

Andrew then introduced John Fleming from the City who is the Managing Director of Planning and the City Planner. Andrew noted that John would be the one bringing the motion to adopt the CMP to Council.

Mr. Fleming introduced himself to the LAC members in attendance and thanked them for their participation in the planning process including the 5 LAC meetings, 2 Open Houses, and a visit to the Orchard Park Sherwood Forest Ratepayers AGM, and for bringing their local perspectives and expertise. Mr. Fleming provided his insight regarding where the CMP stands right now, acknowledging there are a few outstanding issues that the scientists and facilitators from Dillon Consulting will lead us through.

Notes

Item	Discussion
1.	Agenda Item - Welcome to Information Meeting
1.1.	John Blocker posed a question about the documents provided at the meeting [referring to the comment letters received from ACCAC and EEPAC, as well as a Conservation Action Alert from Nature London], wondering who they were specifically addressed to?
1.1.1.	Linda McDougall noted that the January 2018 letter from ACCAC was directed to the Environmental and Parks Planning (E&PP) staff at the City, the December 2017 EEPAC Statement and Recommendations were from EEPAC's agenda (and the Planning and Environment Committee (PEC) agenda) and the Nature London Conservation Action Alert was distributed to subscribers and was forwarded to E&PP staff at the City.
1.1.2.	Jack noted he was aware of one other document (referring to an alternate report) that was submitted for inclusion on the February PEC agenda but was not included in the documents provided to the members of the LAC.
1.1.3.	Linda noted that any documents submitted to the clerk for the PEC meeting were not sent to or received by City staff in E&PP and therefore would not be presented as part of the LAC process but included as part of the PEC meeting when it occurs.
1.1.4.	Karla Kolli reiterated that one of the focuses of this meeting was regarding AODA and the specific letters provided from EEPAC and ACCAC to the City, as these are two official committees that advise Council.
1.1.5.	Jack noted that he was still "baffled" by the choice of documents that were circulated to the LAC for this meeting.

1.1.6. Andrew closed off this comment by noting that the documents circulated to the LAC, in particular the ACCAC and EEPAC formal responses, were those that were received by City staff at E&PP. Andrew also noted that City staff from E&PP have not seen the document Jack was referring to.

2. Agenda Item - AODA and the CMP Process

2.1. Sandy Levin requested clarification on the wording in the AODA concerning “new or redeveloping” of trails and “must”. If the City is not constructing new trails or redeveloping trails then there is no “must” and no requirement to make trails accessible?

2.1.1. Jen Petruniak reiterated Dillon and the City’s interpretation of the AODA, as presented on the slides [that once the CMP process is started, the review pertains to all trails within the defined boundary of the ESA], and asked Michael Dawthorne to provide ACCAC’s interpretation as well.

2.1.2. Michael noted that ACCAC sees the CMP as applying to the entire valley and when an ESA is under review during a CMP process accessibility of trails for the entire feature is to be reviewed as a whole. This implies that a review of all trails in the MVHF ESA (south) was required though doesn’t mean all trails would be required to be made accessible. Michael noted that ACCAC’s interpretation of the AODA with regards to trails is the same as Dillon and City’s based on direction provided in the Guidelines. Michael closed his statement by also noting that improving accessibility of trails following the Guidelines doesn’t conflict with or override protection of the valley or the environment.

2.1.3. Jen touched on accessibility and protection of the environment as working together following the Guidelines, noting the exceptions under the AODA and noting that an example of how the exception is applied by the City, according to the Guidelines, will be provided during the presentation.

2.2. Mady Hymowitz posed the question whether any other CMP’s for ESAs have used this interpretation of AODA.

2.2.1. Andrew noted that other CMP’s, the most recent being The Coves, did include the same interpretation of the AODA.

2.2.2. Jen also noted that this is the first CMP applying the 2016 Guidelines and that the previous 2012 Trail Standards had too much ambiguity with regards to the definition of management zones and applicable types of trails permitted to consistently apply the AODA.

2.3. Jack wanted to gain a better understanding of the AODA as it applies to trails. Jack questioned that if the City is reviewing all trails then under AODA, all trails have to be made accessible?

2.3.1. Jen provided a response that while all trails are reviewed as part of the CMP process in the Guidelines, not all trails would need to be made accessible if the exceptions identified under the AODA apply. Jen referred back to the exceptions under the AODA which were provided on one of the presentation slides. As part of the review of trails, the City is required under the AODA to make trails accessible where this doesn’t pose a significant risk that would adversely affect water, fish, wildlife, plants, invertebrates, species at risk, ecological integrity and/or natural heritage values. The Guidelines are

clear that in less sensitive, culturally influenced, Natural Environment zones and over sewers for example, accessible trails are permitted and will be provided.

3. Agenda Item – References to AODA in Guidelines

- 3.1. A pause was made during the presentation for any questions regarding this portion of the presentation. No questions or comments were made.

4. Agenda Item – Revisions to MVHF ESA (south) CMP/Overview of Revisions to Final CMP - Trail Strategy (Maps)

- 4.1. Katrina Moser noted being confused that the bridge at location D is now okay and included in the CMP. Katrina referred to thinking that D had been noted in a previous version of the CMP as not being considered due to environmental concerns.

- 4.1.1. Jen noted that the D location was previously included in the August 2017 version of the CMP and complied with the Guidelines and was dropped in the October version as there was uncertainty regarding feasibility for implementation and challenges with providing accessibility up to Access 13 in a Nature Reserve zone. The D location was previously noted as a likely candidate for stepping stones or a bridge. Jen provided an overview of the bridge feasibility review Dillon engineers undertook as an extra step (and not part of the CMP process) to determine whether a pedestrian bridge would be feasible. Jen noted that a pedestrian bridge similar in specifications to what was most recently constructed in the MVHF ESA (north) near Sunningdale Road W. is feasible at both locations A and D.

- 4.1.2. Mady wanted to clarify that the bridge noted at D was the one that was included in previous draft and then taken off.

- 4.1.3. Jen confirmed that there was a “linkage” (i.e., stepping stones or a bridge) identified at location D that was included in the August 2017 draft of the CMP and then removed in the subsequent October 2017 version.

- 4.2. Andrew noted that ACCAC’s original request was that a connection from A13 to A18/A19 which would not be feasible without a bridge in place. It was also noted that the request of ACCAC could not be included as this would have required Level 2 trails in Natural Reserve which would not comply with the Guidelines. To fulfill the ACCAC request, the request for an accessible connection was revised by ACCAC in their January 2018 letter, to be from A11 to D and from D to A18/A19.

- 4.3. Susan Hall (attended as EEPAC’s alternate rep.) noted that AODA compliance seems paramount and wanted clarification on the process and why the AODA was not mentioned at the beginning?

- 4.3.1. Michael noted the AODA was in place well before Guidelines were developed, and during the development of the Guidelines the AODA was included.

- 4.3.2. Chris Sheculski noted that principles of AODA were brought up during first LAC meetings.

- 4.3.3. Karla also provided clarification that the AODA was brought into the development of the Guidelines, as approved by Council, and was outlined right at the beginning of the LAC meetings.

- 4.4. Alex Vanderkam wanted clarification that the LAC would get a copy of the final CMP.

4.4.1. Jen confirmed that LAC members would be circulated a link to the final CMP prior to submission of the document to the PEC.

5. **Agenda Item - EEPAC (and Nature London) Concerns/ Response to EEPAC Concerns**

5.1. A pause was made for any questions regarding this portion of the presentation. No questions or comments were made.

6. **Next Steps**

6.1. Mady feels like she has been put in a difficult position. Appreciates the needs and requirements of AODA as raised by ACCAC, but feels sandbagged with the appearance of a bridge at D that was previously removed in the October 2017 version of the CMP.

6.1.1. John Fleming noted the City was committed to the continued consultation with the LAC, as evidenced by presenting the revised content in the MVHF ESA (south) CMP to the LAC first, prior to submission to PEC or distribution to the general public via the City website.

6.2. Susan brought up her previous comment regarding ACCAC/AODA. Susan noted it would have been more appropriate to have received more overview on how the AODA would factor into the CMP process and trail management strategy component earlier in the process. Susan expressed how she felt like the opinions of the ACCAC were not clearly represented during the LAC meetings.

6.3. Katrina echoed Mady's comment and also has concerns that the timeline is rather short with the upcoming presentation of the CMP to the PEC being March 19. Katrina noted that this would not allow enough time to present the final CMP to EEPAC prior to the PEC meeting. Katrina requested more time to allow her to bring this back to EEPAC to review as D was not included prior to.

6.3.1. Jen wanted to know what Katrina would like to bring back.

6.3.2. Katrina wanted to see comparison of maps again and those would be the most crucial to bring back to EEPAC

6.3.3. Linda noted that the August version of the CMP did include the Linkage at location D and the City received comments back from EEPAC with regards to Linkage D. E&PP staff and Dillon provided formal Memo responses to EEPAC's comments which were circulated on EEPAC's agenda and through the LAC.

6.3.4. Jen also noted that the linkage at location D has always been presented as complying with the Guidelines.

6.4. Sandy requested that the slides be provided prior to the March 7 release of the finalized report also noting a tight timeline to get anything on the PEC agenda.

6.5. As there were concerns regarding the presented timeline of releasing the final CMP on March 7 to the LAC and the presentation to the PEC being March 19, Karla inquired with the City whether the March 19 date is set or open for discussion.

6.5.1. Andrew noted that it would be possible to move the presentation date.

6.5.2. John also noted that City can be flexible with the dates but does want to avoid delaying the process much further noting we have heard from the scientists at Dillon that the revised CMP complies with Guidelines. The City doesn't want to rush the process but

does want to move things forward as many members of the LAC are looking forward to implementation of the CMP.

- 6.5.3. Jen also noted that the information in the final document is similar to the August 2017 version with regards to the bridge at D and other revisions are minor.
- 6.6. Discussion was held between the LAC members, City and Dillon as a more appropriate date to present the CMP to the PEC given the overlapping March break and Easter/Passover with upcoming PEC meetings. It was agreed upon by the LAC members in attendance that the April 16 meeting of the PEC would allow for more time to review the final CMP and submit items for the PEC meeting agenda.
- 6.7. The City and Dillon will review the revised timeline and let the LAC know when the revised CMP would be available.
- 6.8. This information meeting concluded at 18:35.

Errors and/or Omissions

These minutes were prepared by Jonathan Harris (Dillon Consulting) who should be notified of any errors and/or omissions.