



Sandwich South Servicing Master Plan: Meeting Summary for Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #1

On July 27, 2020, the City of Windsor hosted the first Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting for the Sandwich South Master Servicing Plan. The meeting was held virtually via Zoom from 6:30 – 8:30 PM.

The focus of this first meeting was to:

- Introduce the project to the SAC members;
- Provide an overview of the roles and responsibilities of the SAC members;
- Provide an update on the work completed to date and respond to questions related to technical work;
- Review what we heard from Stage 1 of engagement, including the Issues that Matter and solicit input on the issues;
- Discuss upcoming engagement including PIC #1 and solicit the SAC's feedback on the proposed approach; and
- Discuss next steps of the project.

A list of SAC members and project team staff in attendance for meeting #1 is attached as **Appendix 1**.

1. Welcome and Project Introduction

The meeting began with a First Nation land acknowledgement.

The meeting facilitator, Karla Kolli (Dillon Consulting), provided an overview of meeting mechanics for Zoom and the meeting agenda. The group was introduced to the Project Managers for this project: Patrick Winters (City of Windsor) and Nicole Caza (Dillon Consulting). Nicole presented an introduction to the project, which included the study area, growth figures for Windsor, what a Servicing Master Plan is and why it is needed in Sandwich South.

2. SAC Role

SAC members were provided with the SAC Terms of Reference (ToR) in advance of the meeting. This document outlines the roles, responsibilities and function of the committee. The meeting facilitator gave a high level overview of the ToR, presenting the purpose and objectives of the SAC.



Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #1 Meeting Summary July 27, 2020

- It was clarified that the meetings will be recorded and documented (with a record of the meeting minutes), which would be distributed to the SAC members who can provide comment on completeness and accuracy.
- It was clarified that the Terms of Reference does not need to be formally adopted by the SAC members. Rather, members were to read the ToR and confirm that there were no concerns, conflicts of interest or discomfort with the document and its content.

An overview of the membership composition was provided. The SAC membership composition highlights is intended to reflect the variety of different perspectives who might be interested or affected by this project. SAC members were asked if they felt like there was any representation missing from the membership.

- It was noted that James Sylvestre Enterprise logo should be removed from the list, as they are not being represented as part of this SAC.

3. SAC Member Introductions & Icebreaker

SAC Members were asked to introduce themselves by providing their name, organization and role. As an icebreaker activity, members were also asked to provide an answer to the question: *“What word would you use to describe your future vision for Sandwich South?”* The following is a list of the words provided from members:

- | | | |
|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| ● Liveable | ● Transitional | ● Diverse |
| ● Complete | ● Green | ● Safe |
| ● Sustainable | ● Great Living | ● Potential |
| ● Barrier-free | ● Community | |

4. Study Overview

Andrea Winter (Project Coordinator, Dillon Consulting), provided an overview of the Study, which included where we are in the project schedule, the integration of this project with existing plans and studies, and an overview of technical work completed and upcoming for the different technical areas.

Natural Environment

To date, three seasons of field data collection has been completed. This data will form the basis for the Study’s consideration of natural heritage, environmentally significant areas, species-at-risk and species of conservation concern. This data will help identify the restrictions and constraints for development.

Floodplain Mapping



Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #1 Meeting Summary July 27, 2020

To assist with the master servicing plan development, the technical team has been formulating floodplain mapping which includes hydraulic and hydrological models. This has been an iterative process with various design storms being considered and different scenarios and outcomes being tested. Using existing data and stormwater information, floodplain elevations were developed. The model is currently under review by ERCA and a third party reviewer.

Stormwater Management (SWM) Facilities

Various SWM options have been identified for consideration for the study area. This includes centralized SWM facilities along corridors to promote natural linkages; centralized SWM facilities to have shared pump stations to manage runoff; and SWM facilities to be designed and constructed as development proceeds and developed by multiple landowners. The SWM strategy is designed to be flexible, to support individual landowners to proceed independently, while minimizing the number of total SWM facilities.

Specific technologies that will be reviewed for the SWM approach include: traditional wet ponds, dry ponds within the Airport Zones, and low impact development techniques.

Transportation

To date, travel demand forecasting has been completed to determine the future transportation needs for the study area. This was done based on assumptions about the extent of travel by different modes (i.e. transit, cycling, etc.) from the Windsor Transit Master Plan and Walk Wheel Windsor. Vehicular, active transit, and public transit modes were all analyzed. These findings are being used to determine the road needs and boundary connections in the study area for the 20 year horizon, and beyond.

Sanitary and Storm Sewers

Topography information and existing Environmental Assessment (EA) documents were used to determine the location of preliminary sanitary and storm sewer drainage areas. Other completed work includes determining the sizing of trunk sewers, evaluating the capacity of existing trunk sanitary sewers (which has been identified as sufficient for development), and determining the phasing approach for sanitary and storm within the area.

Question and Answers

After the Study Overview was provided, a question and answer (Q & A) period allowed SAC members to ask questions about the technical components of the study, with various technical team members on the call to answer. The following is a record of this Q & A Period.

Q = Question, A = Answer, C = Comment.

Q: To what extent does the analysis consider impacts to the stormwater system as a whole vs. just what would be necessary for the Sandwich South lands? As we develop all this vacant land, the water will need to go somewhere and will there be impacts downstream.



Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #1 Meeting Summary July 27, 2020

A: We are looking at the system from a watershed basis so that we can look cumulatively at the long-term effects of development not just in the local drains where development is occurring but also the effects downstream. By setting up the model we have developed to analyze flows in the downstream system, we can come up with a SWM strategy that control for future development effects. We will have safety factors in our design to account for uncertainties and future climate effects.

A: Outlet flow restrictions will also be provided with respect to the proposed development lands such that property owners are aware of the outlet capacities from any land that is developed.

A: ERCA is an approval authority for this work and is involved as the work is being undertaken. As part of the process for floodplain mapping, we have had an independent peer review team to review findings as an extra level of safety, to ensure that the assumptions being carried are appropriate.

Q: The municipal drain modelling and capacity analysis and the full understanding of this component has yet to come, is that correct?

A: The team has evaluated the existing and anticipated future capacity of the drains and what the cross sections need to be for these drains in order to accommodate the expected flow. The actual process of the Municipal Drain Act and the associated reporting has not been initiated but will form part of our overall project.

Q: What is going to happen when it comes time to hook existing residents into the trunk line sewer? What does that process look like, how is that connected to all of this and what would be a timeline?

A: The process is going to be similar to what residents are experiencing on Baseline Road. It's the City's intention to get everybody on sanitary service. It will be a local improvement. Baseline is the first of 3 roads to be experiencing this. This work is not related to the master plan.

Q: Where will the funding come from if there are improvements required outside of Sandwich South proper, if the development within the study area requires there be investment in other parts of the City?

A: From a storm perspective, the Upper Little River Study is set up so that different sections could proceed without having to trigger downstream improvements. It is not expected that any improvements are necessary north of the CP tracks. There are no foreseeable impacts on areas outside of the Study Area, so no funding has been dedicated for this purpose at this time.



Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #1
Meeting Summary
July 27, 2020

C: The situation is already not good for residents when it rains in certain areas. There are not many solutions at the moment. Hopefully it is going to improve. I want to advocate for the people who are already being affected in the area by a poor SWM system.

A: We know the issues we have had along Baseline Road and the 6th Concession drain resulting from development proceeding upstream of Provincial Road and other places that have negatively affected the system. That is why this Study is underway and considering potential surface water impacts in a cohesive manner for all of Sandwich South.

C: There are going to be a lot of expectations and we need to demonstrate that these studies are integrated and that the various studies are working together to create solutions.

A: This is an important message for our team to think about as we prepare for a public event - the information presented must demonstrate how the various studies work together.

Q: What did we find from the completed natural environment studies? Are there going to be challenges on that front?

A: We have completed all 3 seasons of field work. We are in the process of compiling that into a visual format with specific details. We knew areas that were already previously identified and we checked them as well as other areas. What we have been told from the team lead is that we did not find anything that was not expected. . Everything that was found will be considered in our solutions.

Q: Will members of this Committee see the Natural Environment Report?

A: There will be additional information provided at the PICs and all the results will be included in the Master Plan document.

Q: Do you have a figure that illustrates the storm sewer locations and sizes available? It would be easier than to follow the word descriptions. Would this information be available at the next meeting?

A: It is anticipated that a map of the existing storm sewers would be available at the upcoming PIC. We do have a draft of it, but we just need to make sure that we do not need to adjust any of the drainage study areas based on the comments we received back from ERCA. We can share this information when we have completed this work as we know it affects development moving forward.

C: I would like to see the floodplain mapping as something that is more in layman's terms, to make it easier for people without the technical background easier to understand.

Q: Could this project have a downstream impact on Tecumseh and is there some representation from this community and communication with them on what this impact might be?

A: Through the project study, we have members from the Town of Tecumseh on our Steering Committee so they are included in the process.

Q: Can someone explain what we are looking at on the floodplain map for clarity?

A: The floodplain map is showing results from a 2D model showing where water would spill over the landscape during a 100 year storm event, and a “quasi-steady state” which assumes that it keeps raining and the floodplains keep on filling. This provides a conservative estimate of how wide and deep flooding could be in a 100 year event. This is not to say that there would be development restriction in all the areas that are blue (coloured), as this study will identify ways for us to widen and enhance many of the main drains so that we can actually lower the flood levels shown. We intend to manage and maintain the shallow flooding that could happen.

C: We need to make sure that the above message is clear when we present it to the community.

Q: After the recommendations are put forward to improve floodplain drainage, is it possible to have that same type of map (as above) to show the before and after so that people can really see the implications of the solutions?

A: Yes. That is how we want to show that we are making things better, while still providing the same amount of storage that was there in the first place or better. That is exactly what we want to show with our preferred alternative - we want to show that we meet or exceed the objectives and that at the very minimum we won't be making anything worse. Our intention is to reduce risk and make things better.

Q: In reference to slide 22 showing the SWM facilities. A lot of the concentration seems to be on the western part of the transferred lands. Does the area east of Lauzon Parkway and north of County Road 42 (outside of the Town of Tecumseh) have the same centralized stormwater functional design or is that not part of this phase of the work?

A: Our initial analysis is focusing on the East Pelton Development Lands, County Road 42 Secondary Planning Area and Tecumseh Hamlet Area Lands as these lands are likely to face development pressure sooner. We have not initiated our analysis for the broader study area yet.

Q: Dillon is also in the County Road 42 reconstruction by the County of Essex, which would be fronting those lands towards the east. Is the timing of that going to impact how bringing services to those lands will occur?

A: Through the County Road 42 work, we are currently in the process of going through stormwater information. Timing and impact will be confirmed with the applicable design team involved with the County Road 42 project.

5. Consultation

Members were provided with an update of the engagement that has occurred to date (Stage 1), which included a pop-up event, online survey, technical meetings and website updates; and the proposed upcoming engagement (Stage 2), which includes a Public Information Centre (PICs) and Stakeholder Meetings.

6. Issues that Matter

Based on the public feedback collected from Stage 1 of engagement, an “Issues that Matter” report was created to summarize what we heard from the public. The themes from this report and some of the specific comments were presented to the SAC members. The themes included: Stormwater Management, Flood Mitigation, Cost Impacts to Residents, Appropriate Road Networks, Environmental Protection, and Limiting Development and Sprawl.

The SAC members were asked if any issues were missing, and if there were any other considerations that should be added. The following were identified for the team to consider. It is noted that a number of these considerations are currently outside the scope of the master plan.

- Include consideration of accessibility in all the work
- Consider the route/travel path for EMS and whether a station is required in these lands. (It was noted by the City that this type of community facility is typically identified through the development approvals process and that Windsor Fire and EMS should consider providing comments on the need for Fire/EMS facilities through that process)
- Consider whether a new school is required for this development. (It was noted by the City that the school board generally identifies where they require new schools. We have not received any comment on schools from them for the East Pelton or County Road 42 Secondary Plan areas.)
- Consider looking at the greenspaces not just for water management, but the greenspaces that are in the developments and the recreational opportunities. (It was noted by the City that recreation lands are typically identified through the secondary plan process and there are some lands identified for the East Pelton and County Road 42 Secondary Plans. The future secondary plan for the remainder of the Sandwich South



Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #1 Meeting Summary July 27, 2020

Area will have the benefit of this Servicing Master Plan which will inform the land use study and allow a more accurate identification of lands for recreational opportunities.)

The Issues that Matter Report will be circulated to the SAC with the meeting notes so that SAC members can see the specific comments raised under each theme.

Q: Just for clarity, that secondary land use plan (above) is entirely independent from everything we are doing here?

A: It's not independent of it. That secondary plan is going to be based on what we are putting together here. This SMP gives us the skeleton of the infrastructure that we need going forward to support the population we know we are going to have. What the more detailed secondary land use plan is going to do is put more flesh on the bones of where those uses are going to be. Right now we have a general idea of where those are going to be and we know how much, what that secondary plan is going to tell us is where specifically those uses are going to be within the remainder of the Sandwich South Area.

The section concluded with some explanation on how the Issues that Matter will be used in this project moving forward, which will be to inform project objectives and evaluation criteria.

7. PIC #1

As part of the next phase of engagement, a Public Information Centre (PIC) is proposed. Members were provided with the main objectives of the PIC and the proposed approach, which includes both an online and in-person component. Both options are tentatively scheduled for the week of August 24, 2020, with the in-person option dependent on covid-19 regulations.

Members were provided with sample PIC boards in advance of the meeting. These boards were shown and the group was asked for their thoughts on the following:

- 1) Are the sample boards public-friendly in how information is presented?
- 2) What do you think are the key messages that need to be communicated to the public at PIC #1?
- 3) Are we asking the right questions in our activities?
- 4) Other considerations?

The following is the feedback received from SAC Members:

- Growth assumptions should be confirmed. There were many years where there was hardly any growth in this area. Are we on the correct path here and using the right numbers in preparing for addressing that growth?

- The CMA area is shown and the population info talks about the CMA area. Would be helpful to also talk about the City's population and the City's share of that CMA number?
- From a context point of view, 2.5% is a high percentage in Canada. Perhaps we should add what previous growth figures were for Windsor to provide people with context.
- There should be some of the reasoning on the boards behind why we should be planning so far into the future. As mentioned, population projections can be wrong, so an explanation on why you want to plan far ahead anyways, even if the numbers are wrong would be beneficial.
- C: When talking about the process in the beginning boards, perhaps we can do separate boards highlighting the community consultation process. With details about how to get involved, the project website, etc.

8. Next Steps

The next steps of the project were presented, which includes the continuation of the development of alternatives, upcoming engagement, and upcoming SAC meeting dates.

Members were encouraged to continue to send any questions or comments to the project team via email at sandwichsouth@dillon.ca.



Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #1 Meeting Summary July 27, 2020

APPENDIX 1 – Attendance

SAC Members

Andrea DeJong, Windsor Fire (Alternate for Stephen Laforet)
Jim Abbs, City of Windsor (Planning)
Deanne Crawford, Transit Windsor
James Bryant, Essex Region Conservation Authority (ERCA)
Surendra Bagga, Windsor Accessibility Advisory Committee (Alternate for Peter Best)
Ellen Van Wageningen, Windsor Bicycling Committee
Kieran McKenzie, Ward 9 Councillor
Steve Tuffin, Windsor International Airport
Jennifer DeMaeyer, Multicultural Council of Windsor-Essex County
Josette Eugenie, Agricultural and Future Development Interests
Abdul Habib, Land Owner

Other Members

Tiziano Zaghi, Planning Consultant for Abdul Habib

City of Windsor

Ana Godo, Engineering
Fahd Mikhael, Engineering
France Isabelle Tunks, Development Projects
Jeff Hagan, Transportation Planning
Patrick Winter, Project Manager
Mark Winterton, Public Works
Shawna Boakes, Traffic Operations & Parking
Wira Vendrasco, Legal Services

Dillon Consulting

Amy Farkas
Andrea Winter
Daniel Hoang
Karla Kolli
Nicole Caza
Rob Muir
Rob Molloconi
Shawn Doyle