



Legislative and Planning Services
1151 Bronte Road,
Oakville, ON L6M 3L1
Fax: 905.825.8822

September 27, 2013

Mr. Michael Crough
Planning & Building Department
City of Burlington
426 Brant Street, Box 5013
Burlington ON L7R 3Z6

Dear Mr. Crough:

**Re: Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment and Zoning Bylaw Amendment
Part of Lots 7, 8, and 9, Concession II EF and Part of the Unopened Road Allowance between Lots 7 and 8
(Paletta Lands)
Part of Lot 7, Concession I EF (Taylor Lands)
Files 505-12/04, 510-06/04, 520-23/04, 24T-04006/B (Paletta Lands)
Files 505-13/04, 520-24/04, 510-07/04, 024Y-04007/B (Taylor Lands)
UPDATED TO REFLECT REVISED/UPDATED STUDIES**

Halton Region has received the above noted applications and offers the following **UPDATED** comments. The comments reflect the Region's review of the updated Environmental Impact Assessment and FSR provided by the applicant in early 2013 and the site visits which took place in the summer of 2013.

Please be advised the Region's previous comments are still applicable and the following comments are an update to the sections labelled *Servicing* and *Environmental Impact Assessment* from the Region's 2012 letter. During the original circulation, Regional staff did not identify any Regional issues with respect to transportation issues, the Region will not be commenting on the updated Traffic Impact Study.

Servicing Comments

Existing Water & Wastewater Services

There is a 250mm diameter watermain on Waterdown Road adjacent to the proposed subdivision and a 150mm diameter watermain on Flatt Road adjacent to the proposed subdivision. There is no watermain on Flatt Road Extension. On Ireson Road, adjacent to the proposed subdivision, there is a 150mm diameter watermain and no watermain exists on Horning Road. Craven Avenue and a small portion of Nevarc Drive contain a 150mm diameter watermain. There is a 300mm diameter watermain on the southerly portion of Panin Road.

With respect to wastewater mains, a 300mm diameter main exists on Waterdown Road at Craven Avenue, just south and east of the proposed subdivision.

Regional staff have reviewed the Functional Servicing Report prepared by Metropolitan Consulting Inc. dated March 2013 for the above noted plans of subdivision and have the following comments.

1. Section 7 does not appear to state the number of units that were approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in 1996, which would be helpful for context to the currently proposed number of units.
2. The report acknowledges that there are three options for the location of the proposed reservoir. The final location of the reservoir will be established by a Class Environmental Assessment to be carried out by the Region. It should be further acknowledged that the timing of the reservoir is dependent on the completion of the Class EA.
3. Please revise Section 7.2 - The Waterdown Standpipe has a TWL of 277.7 m which results in existing pressures on Flatt Road of 188 to 210 psi.
4. Section 7.3 - Ground contour elevations for Zone B2 would range from 97.5 m to 132.0 m based on the reservoir range of operation from 166 to 167.9 metres. Revise accordingly.
5. Based on our review of pressure requirements for the area, Zone B3A should have a TWL of 202 m which would accommodate ground contours of 132 to 168 m. Zone B4A would have a TWL of 236 M to accommodate ground contours of 168 to 200 metres. Revise Accordingly.
6. Section 7.4 - ID 6863 has a cost of \$5.265M identified in the most recent Sustainable Halton Master Plan. Revise accordingly.
7. Consideration is being given to construction of the Zone B5A Pump Station at the Zone B3A reservoir rather than at the Waterdown Road Pump Station. There should be further discussion on this in the report.
8. Consideration is being given to replacing the 400 mm watermain on North Service Road (ID 5881) with a PRV between Zones B3A and B2. There should be further discussion on this in the report.
9. The last paragraph of Section 7.4 should be revised to reflect that all identified projects are scheduled for Design 2016, Construction 2017 and "In Service" 2019 except for ID 6602 which is Design 2017, Construction 2018 and "In Service" 2019.
10. Section 7.5 - A contour limit of 132 m would be more appropriate for Zone B2. Revise accordingly.
11. Section 7.6 - The text refers to Locations A, B & C for the reservoir where Figure 7-13 identifies them as Locations 1, 2 & 3. Revise accordingly.
12. Halton has always allowed local mains to be connected to trunk mains, but has prohibited service connections. Please revise the last paragraph of Section 7.6 to reflect this.
13. Section 7.7 - Halton uses chlorine and Hamilton uses chloramines (not the other way around). Please revise.
14. In the last paragraph of Section 7.7 please replace the line "If a Halton only solution is preferred" with "Although it is possible at this point to maintain use of the existing Hamilton B5A supply, provision must be made for a Halton supply".
15. Section 7.8 – Please note that the Zone B3A Pump Station must supply max day demands rather than "max day plus fire". Fire demand will be stored in the proposed B3A reservoir.
16. In order to allow for the possibility of supplying B2 fire demands from Zone B3A, please allow for a reservoir fire flow calculation of 250 L/s for 3 hours. Please revise Section 7.8 accordingly.

17. Rather than use Table 8.1 of the MOE Guidelines for establishing fire protection, Halton uses the Fire Underwriters Survey to establish flows. Please allow for the fire demand of 250 L/s for 3 hours. Please revise Section 7.8 accordingly.
18. Figure 7-11 - The zone boundary between Zones B2 and B3A does not follow the 132m contour. Revise Figure accordingly.
19. The Region would prefer a hard boundary between Zones B3A and B2 rather than the use of PRVs south of Flatt Road to create a sub-zone. Revise Figure 7-11 accordingly.
20. A clear summary of units/population by proposed pressure zone is needed to accurately size the pump stations and reservoir. This is required for lands within and external to the Eagle Heights and Taylor Subdivisions. I would recommend obtaining guidance from the City of Burlington Planning Department, and including this information in the study.
21. Please clarify the intent to install a watermain through lands located south of the existing Waterdown Road Reservoir (as shown on figure 7.11). Halton is in receipt of a development plan from the land owner of this location that would prevent creation of a utility corridor as shown.
22. The Region notes that the watermain has been doubled on Street A, presumably to provide looping. The Region recommends a single main be installed. All dead end mains should be provided with auto-flushers. These auto-flushers must include provision to discharge the water used in flushing. Please revise the watermain plan accordingly.
23. For wastewater mains, Section 7.10, please remove reference to “first section 150 mm sewers” and replace with, to be in conformance with Halton’s Linear Design Standards.
24. The lands to the west and the south of the these subdivisions, between Panin Road and Flatt Road, are schematically shown as being able to be serviced by gravity wastewater main (sanitary sewers). Please provide topographical, contour and elevation information to support the design of gravity sanitary sewers to these areas.
25. Include an Implementation Plan in the report for all water and wastewater component works internal and/or external to their subdivisions that are directly related to the Region’s Master Plans projects including the Sustainable Halton Water & Wastewater Master Plan projects that the Region currently forecasts for design and construction in future years as per the Region’s Capital Budget. Should the owner/developers require some works to ahead of the Region’s timing then they will be responsible to front end finance the works until the Region has identified the works in a current year Capital Budget.
26. Servicing work required for this development is to be coordinated with any municipal road project initiated by the City of Burlington. Project timing for roadwork initiated by the City of Burlington which may be impacted by Regional servicing works should be included in the Implementation Plan.

The Functional Servicing Report needs to be revised to reflect the above noted comments.

Environmental Impact Assessment (2010, Savanta) – Mirek Sharp, North South Environmental:
Comments

1.2 Summary of the Proposed Development: Although this is a new application, the EIA relies on development limits established in OPA 197 and the NAIR report. However, these documents pre-date the 2005 PPS and the associated 2010 reference manual, and various other policy guidance document (SWH 2000) and legislation (ESA), and therefore do not reflect the prevailing policy regime. Because of this, the development limits used to develop this EIA need to be tested

and confirmed against the current policy regime. This has not been done, although the EIA notes the 2010 NHRM was consulted (pg 4).

The Region notes that the list of bullets listing principles and criteria that have been adhered to includes 'Retaining any significant ... vegetation ...' However, it is noted that there has been recent (2013) cutting along the edges of the Significant Woodlands in many places, thus this principle, at least, has not been respected.

3.1.2 Soils and Physiography: The text indicates that there is little evidence of erosion on valley slopes. During the site visit a thorough inventory of slopes was not conducted, however, even in the brief reconnaissance visits there were at least two areas on Tributary 5 where substantial erosion gullies resulting from run-off from the adjacent tablelands were noted. This speaks to the need to be careful not to direct rear-yard surface drainage to the ravine slopes, provide a fully vegetated buffer and to substantial erosion control measures during construction. There is a huge potential for slope erosion during construction and once it occurs it will be exceedingly difficult to repair owing to the steepness of the ravine slopes.

3.2 Biological Baseline Conditions: The intro provides a very brief description of the landscape context of the site. However it does not identify the important linkage function performed by Grindstone Creek valley in providing connection between the Escarpment and associated natural features and the lake Ontario/Cootes Paradise area to the south. Given the extent of the barriers (development, utility and transportation corridors) that separate the Escarpment from the Lake, this linkage is critical and needs to be preserved. This argues for higher than normal protection measures along the valley.

3.2.2 Vascular Plants and Significant Species: The text claims that Eastern Flowering Dogwood has not been found on the site since 1994 and it is not addressed further in the report. However two individual stems were located by CH staff during one of the site visits. As this is an Endangered Species it will need to be addressed. The EIA text indicates that it was not found in 2007, 2009 or 2012. However, the methods and Appendix B indicate that there were no botanical searches undertaken in 2012, and that the two in 2007 and 2009 were undertaken in August, when this species is not conspicuous. Given that two individual stems were located in a brief site walk, we question whether there has been adequate searches conducted for this species. Given its Endangered status, it is recommended a search be undertaken for it in the spring when it is in flower and more easily detected.

There is no summary of Regionally rare plants – these assist in characterizing the site and although not providing a lot of weight from a protection perspective are still important for understanding the overall significance of natural features on and adjacent to the site.

3.2.3 Wildlife: In the discussion of significant birds, the report takes a very site-oriented perspective, indicating that there are few of these species on the property and there is more habitat for them on adjacent lands. A more ecological approach would be to recognize the extent of the landscape that supports viable populations of these species and that development impacts that would reduce/eliminate these species from the site constitute a reduction in the population sizes in the general area. Even if the majority of the populations occur off-site, this does not provide a rationale for impacting them on the site.

3.2.4: Aquatic Ecology: Tributary 4: The Region does not think the origin of Tributary 4 is correctly identified, nor is its full extent mapped on the various Figures. Tributary 4 has its origins in the mowed grass landscape associated with a residence immediately north of the Eagle Heights lands. There is a defined swale that focuses run-off from these lands and directs them onto the northernmost field on the Eagle Heights property. This swale eventually develops into a channel and flows through a culvert in a hedgerow separating the two agricultural fields adjacent to Waterdown Road, on the Eagle Heights land. The channel meanders southward, and as described in the EIS, forms a small Typha-dominated wetland north of Flatt Road. It is doubtful there is much contribution of flow from Waterdown Road as there is no

evidence of surface run-off along the bank of the road where it is adjunct to the channel. The Region defers to Conservation Halton for comments regarding the fisheries potential of this watercourse.

Tributary 5: There is no description of the Tributary 5 valley on or adjacent to the Taylor Lands.

Both Tributaries: Figure 11 identifies both valleys “minor valleys” and assigns a 7.5. m buffer. Buffers will be addressed elsewhere, but the Region would like to understand how the identification of this valley as “minor” was determined. Certainly on the Taylor lands the ravine slope is steep and well-vegetated and would not, in our opinion, be considered to be minor. The text describes them as “deep ravine valleys” at Flatt Road.

3.2.2: Vascular Plants and Significant Species: The Halton ESA Consolidation Report (April 2005) lists rare plant and animal species known from Grindstone Creek Valley that are not included in the EIA. Likewise, the Halton Natural Areas Inventory provides lengthy lists of significant plants and animals that are not mentioned or discussed in the report. Even if these species do not actually occur on the subject lands, they need to be addressed with respect to potential impacts as they may occur on adjacent lands.

3.3.1. Significant Portions of Habitat of Endangered and Threatened Species: The text fails to note that Eastern Flowering Dogwood is listed as “Endangered” in Ontario and is thus subject to the Endangered Species Act. This species has been commented on above.

Chimney Swift: While it is agreed that it is unlikely that this species breeds on the site, the July 10th date is too late to be confirming breeding for this species as it could already have left nesting sites, and although unlikely it could be using snags and hollows.

3.3.2 Fish Habitat: The Region defers to Conservation Halton for comments on fish habitat.

3.3.3 Significant Woodlands: The Region has several comments on the analysis of Significant Woodlands.

First, the text uses the NHRM for identifying Significant Woodland on the property. This is not the correct guidance to use as the current Halton Official Plan has criteria for defining Significant Woodland and these would take precedence over the NHRM. Possibly because of this, the extent of Significant Woodland is not fully mapped on Figure 10 and should include the CUP3-3/CUS unit in the north part of the site as well as the CUW 1-5 that extends onto the tableland from the Grindstone Creek valley.

Second, the text notes that the mapping of Significant Woodlands was prepared in the context of earlier agreements among parties. However, since this is a new application, the identification of Significant Woodlands should rely on the current guidance, which would be the Regional OP.

The text also notes that “those limits” (in reference to the earlier agreed-on development limits) are assumed to exclude significant woodlands. However, a comparison of Figures 10 and 11 clearly shows a number of areas where development either encroaches on Significant Woodlands (as mapped on Figure 10), or eliminates substantial portions of Significant Woodlands. The proposed development does not direct development away from these areas and does not appear to be in conformity with the Regional Official Plan.

The section on Significant Woodlands does not address the issue of buffers, particularly the width of buffer that is appropriate to protect the Significant Woodlands that occur within the deep ravines on the property.

3.3.4 Significant Valleylands: The Region questions the adequacy of the 7.5 m buffers that are proposed. One role of the EIA is to assess buffer requirements. This should be based on an assessment of the significance and sensitivity of features. The buffer policies represent minimums and are not intended to be applied without analysis.

The most significant feature that will be affected by this proposed development is the Grindstone Creek Valley. The significance of this feature is not adequately described in the text. It is an ANSI, part of the Greenbelt NHS, and is an ESA. There is no reference to the Region's ESA Consolidation Report from 2005, which provides a summary of the Region's ESAs and shows the Grindstone Valley to have the fifth highest native plant species richness, and 4th highest FQI rating in the Region. It fulfills 11 of the 15 criteria for ESA status, none of which are discussed in the EIS. Varga and Allen (1990) list it as one of the top botanical sites in Halton. The Halton Natural Areas Inventory provides long lists of significant flora and fauna that occur there. The EIA notes that the valley "would seem" to provide Significant Wildlife Habitat (pg 29). Given the significance and sensitivity of this valley system, the EIS should be recommending extraordinary measures to demonstrate how it will be protected from the anticipated long term influx of people and domestic pets. The Natural Area Inventory recommends adequate setbacks to assist in the protection of this feature.

3.3.5: ANSIs: The text indicates that the development area does not encroach into the ANSI. However, a comparison of Figures 2 and 9 clearly shows that the development encroaches on the woodland CUW 1-5 that extends onto the tableland and is part of the ANSI (and which should also be Significant Woodland). Moreover, the ANSI is also part of the Greenbelt NHS and thus requires a minimum 30m Vegetation Protection Zone.

3.3.6 Significant Wildlife Habitat: The Region notes that there are 4 areas of specialized habitat that are identified as not occurring on the subject lands, however, at least two: mature forest and highly diverse areas occur in the Grindstone Creek valley, which occur partially on the subject lands, and in any case certainly need to be addressed from an adjacent lands perspective.

Under "Animal Movement Corridors", Grindstone Creek needs to be identified as a linkage between the Escarpment (and associated ESAs) and Lake Ontario (although it is mentioned in the Summary).

In the Summary of Significant Wildlife Habitat, reference is made to portions that occur on the subject property, however, the EIA must also consider the potential for impact to features to which the subject lands are adjacent in the context of the PPS

4.0 Proposed Development

Table 5: The table title indicates that it illustrates the difference between the 1996 and 2010 plans, but the data appear to compare the 1996 and 2003 plan. The text then describes a 2012 plan. Moreover the Table focuses on the differences in footprint, however, it is anticipated that a large portion, if not the majority of impacts on features will be from the increase in human use and are thus density-dependent. The increase in absolute numbers of people resulting from the development needs to be articulated and discussed as an impact.

4.3 Grading: As noted earlier, there are several places where existing over-bank run-off has resulted in erosion gullies on valley slopes. These may be isolated occurrences, but as there is no mention of them in the text, and no indication that there had been an attempt to locate them all, their frequency is not known. Certainly in these cases preservation of the existing drainage is probably not desirable, although if buffer width was greater and they were vegetated, they may mitigate the problem. The mitigation of these erosional gullies should be looked at in more detail.

4.4.2 Stormwater Management Plan: Figure 11, which shows the proposed development overlaid on the features and buffers does not include the stormwater ponds and outlets (although the SWM Blocks are shown), thus it is difficult to ascertain the direct impacts of the proposed ponds on natural features. However a general comparison of the SWM

Concept from the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Report suggests at least a few issues with respect to the protection of natural features.

Pond 5A is particularly problematic. A large proportion of it encroaches into a deciduous woodland (FOD5-3) identified as Significant Woodland. Also, the rip-rap swale which comprises part of the outlet structure traverses a wooded slope within the Significant Woodland and would entail the removal of trees and disturbance of the slope.

Pond I appears to encroach into a deciduous Significant Woodland (FOD4-1).

Pond 4B shows an outlet structure which is not within the subject lands and the Region does not see how this can be part of the approval. Also, pond 4B encroaches into the wetland area at the south end of the Taylor property.

5.0 1994 EIA Recommendations: In general it is impossible to determine the areas referenced in the Recommendations as 1) Figure 8 is at such a small scale that it is unreadable; and 2) the Blocks, Lot numbers and Street numbers do not correlate to the Draft Plan in the stormwater report (which is at a scale that can be read).

Recommendation 6: this does not appear to be accurate as at least 2 SWM ponds encroach on Significant Woodlands.

6.0 Potential Impacts, Effects, Mitigation and Net Effects: The Region notes that this analysis assumes that the agreements with respect to developable area are still in effect. However, at the outset of this EIA, the proposed development is described as a new application, thus it is not understood how agreements made as part of a previous application are relevant. Because of this assumption a number of impact are not identified, notably the encroachment into Significant Woodland in a number of areas.

6.1.1 Vegetation Removal: Table 4 addresses the removal of vegetation collectively by lumping all areas to be removed into one figure (7.4 ha) and discussing them in general. This does not allow evaluation of the removal in each of the several areas. The Region recommends that there be a short discussion of each occurrence where woodlands are proposed for removal, noting the community, quality, slope, impact on the remaining feature, etc. The Region notes that there is not necessarily agreement with the removal of any woodland.

6.1.2 Significant Portions of the Habitat of Endangered and Threatened Species: Butternut: The Region will defer to the MNR with respect to approvals for protection and/or removal of Butternut; however it is noted that the suggested 5 m outside of drip-line is likely less than the usual 25 m radius from trunk that is generally required.

Eastern Flowering Dogwood: The Region notes that this is not addressed in the conclusions, probably as earlier text claims it is not present on the property. However, two stems were located by CH staff during field visits thus protection measures for this species must be addressed as it is listed as “Endangered” in the Endangered Species Act.

6.1.4 Significant Woodlands: This section confuses the CH buffer requirement for valleys with the determination of adequate buffers for woodlands. There is no indication of where the buffer is measured from, drip-line or trunk. Also, areas of Significant Woodland have recently being removed by the applicant. The new edge was evidently established using a hand-held GPS unit. There is no explanation of the accuracy of this method and it is not clear if these new boundaries were used as a basis for determining buffers as illustrated in the EIA and how they relate to the “agreed on development limits” from the earlier application. As noted earlier, current woodland boundaries need to be flagged in the field with the Region and other agencies as required surveyed and then mapped with appropriate woodland buffers. Only then can impacts be evaluated and conclusions reached.

The text notes that a 15 m buffer is required for woodlands associated with Grindstone Creek. The proposed plan shows some of these woodlands (CUW 1-5) as being partially removed. Moreover, as Grindstone Creek valley is part of the

Greenbelt NHS, the Region believes a minimum 30 m Vegetation Protection Zone is required, subject to an evaluation of adequacy.

The Region does not agree with the claim that no buffers are needed where woodlands are subject to agreement from the 1996 Plan.

6.1.6 Significant Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest: As noted previously, the significance of the Grindstone Creek Valley has been understated in this EIA. It is our opinion that substantial indirect impacts to this valley are unavoidable if this development proceeds. The long term impact resulting from increased use by humans, and the anticipated increase in predatory pets (primarily cats, but also dogs), will overtime degrade the area, and create slope erosion and a result in a reduction of species biodiversity. Rather than steep slopes representing a barrier to residents (as suggested in the EIA), the Region predicts they will serve as a challenge to many, resulting in damage to the sensitive slope vegetation.

The Region does not feel that there are any mitigation measures that will prevent these impacts, although it is agreed that a formal trail system and adequate buffers (more than the proposed 7.5 m), may reduce them. It is important to realize that this indirect impact is density dependent, meaning that it is proportional to the increase in people who live in proximity to the natural features. Because of this, the most effective mitigation is to reduce the density of the development. There are no formulas or thresholds to determine the appropriate density, however in determining a balance, the exceptional significance of Grindstone Creek should be taken into account.

An additional impact that is not specifically noted is encroachment from lots backing onto ravines. Such encroachment is a universal impact in such situations and has noted this in numerous other situations along wooded valleys. To mitigate this it is recommended that there be substantial and continuous fencing of the rear of lots backing onto wooded ravine slopes, especially Grindstone Creek valley, with no provisions for gates. These should be constructed by the builder prior to houses being occupied. The Region also suggest a trail within the buffers along woodland edges, especially where they border ravines. These will further discourage encroachment from lots backing onto ravines. The inclusion of such a trail will require buffers greater than 7.5 m.

Long term indirect impacts to the Grindstone Creek valley will, in our opinion, be the major net impact from this development.

6.1.7 Significant Wildlife Habitat: Many of the comments made above apply here also. With respect to the note about cat control, the Region disagrees that outreach and education is effective. Cat-owners tend to be blind to the incredible impact that cats, even if de-clawed, have on wildlife. We would urge the City to enact a Cat-control By-law. Although these are difficult to enforce, it does empower by-law officers and/or the Humane Society to respond to complaints and address particular situations. Without such a by-law, there is no recourse to respond to particular situations.

The Region does not agree with the suggestion of managing future human access, but not trying to prevent it.

7.0 Conclusions: Development limits need to be revised to reflect updated feature boundaries, as has been suggested, and the Region recommends the draft plan be revised to avoid encroachment into features. Buffers need to be proposed for woodlands (not just wooded valleylands) and the proposed 7.5 m is not adequate given the Region's recommendations regarding encroachment and trails.

The conclusions recognize the long term indirect impact of the proposed development. As noted, in evaluating the merits of this new application against the previously approved application (which had a lower density), the significance of Grindstone Creek should be properly recognized, and consideration given to a plan that would support fewer residents.

Conclusion

Based on the comments above it is clear that Halton Region cannot support the updated studies without additional revisions.

The EIA has provided inadequate information, identification and analysis on a number of issues, including, but not limited to, significant features, buffers and development setbacks, wildlife, endangered species, habitat and impacts of development. Further, to this, while the document clearly identifies the proposal as a new application, it relies heavily on agreements made as part of a previous application. As a result of this approach, the development limits indicated on the plans and in the report do not represent accurate development limits based on current standards, regulations, analysis and protection of the natural environment. The Region is not supportive of this approach and recommends the study be updated to address the current regulatory requirements, policies and standards of practice applicable with respect to natural environment and further, that the draft plan be revised to reflect these updates.

Similarly, there are a number of revisions required to the Functional Servicing Report. Halton Region also notes that as stated in previous comments, there are significant updates and supplementary information required for the Region to be able to adequately evaluate the proposal against the evaluation criteria of NAIR and the principles of good planning among other relevant documents. The applications are not supported by sufficient information addressing the natural heritage features and functions, the ability to adequately service the lands, archaeological and contamination investigations. Regional staff requires additional information prior to providing additional comments or a recommendation.

Halton Region encourages the applicants to submit the requested information. Doing so will allow the Region to conduct a complete and thorough analysis of the proposal and provide a formal position on the applications.

I trust these comments are of assistance to you. Should you wish to discuss any of the contents of this letter in detail, please do not hesitate to contact me directly.

Sincerely,



Laurielle Brooks, BES, MCIP, RPP
Acting Senior Planner, Halton Region
905-825-6000 x7840
Laurielle.brooks@halton.ca

- c. Nancy Mott-Allen, Niagara Escarpment Commission
- Katie-Jane Stewart, Conservation Halton
- Roger Beaman, Thomson Rogers
- James Stiver, Halton Region