

**Round
Robin
Reports**

The following questions are a guide for you to tell us who you are, where you come from, why you are here and what you hope to achieve today. We would also like to know a little about your municipality and its successes (or not) in natural heritage planning.

Your name _____

Name of Municipality/Township or organization: _____

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
Has your Municipality completed sub-watershed studies?	_____	_____	_____
If no, will these begin in the next year?	_____	_____	_____
Does the Official Plan have policies for a natural heritage system?	_____	_____	_____
Does the Official Plan have policies for significant components of the natural heritage system (woodlands, wetlands, watercourses, habitat for VTE species)?	_____	_____	_____
Does the municipality have guidance documents for environmental impact studies?	_____	_____	_____
Do you use routinely the Natural Heritage Reference Manual?	_____	_____	_____

A question that I hope to have answered today is _____

In the past year we

In the coming year we hope to

Round Robin Reports

Bill: We have heard a little bit about why we are here: to sow thoughts, to create actions, and to build habits, and we've heard from Don about what he'd like to see or what good science tells us we should have in the landscape. Right now, I'd like to hear a little a bit from each of you about why you are here and about what you hope to get out of today. In your conference kits you have a yellow sheet called the Round Robin Report. This is an opportunity of each of us in the room to know who else is in the room and probably to discover that many of us have common questions or common needs to be here.

Lorrie Minshall, Grand River Conservation Authority I'm hoping today to find out if Carolinian Canada has objectives, goals or desires or a picture of what a good local natural heritage strategy should look like. We are all working towards something in the Big Picture point of view.

In the past year, we initiated or completed five sub-watershed plans in the Grand River watershed. We worked these watershed communities on a large watershed forest plan. We completed natural hazards mapping which to a large extent contributes toward a natural heritage system in a watershed. We have initiated projects to complete the wetlands evaluation with MNR within a watershed, and we completed with Birds Canada a birds strategy for parts of Southwestern Ontario, that covered the Grand River watershed.

In the coming year, we hope to update the wetlands policy working with our MNR districts and our municipalities, and we're working on a plan for natural heritage systems mapping. We now have budgets in place, and continue to work with our municipalities on natural heritage systems and wetland protection policies.

Ken Forgeron, I'm a Regional Planner from Niagara. We have been through the process of updating our environmental policies. We certainly are taking a natural heritage system approach. We're trying to implement natural heritage system planning using the manual from the MNR and to do this at a regional level.

You may have heard the Province seems to be interested in extending the transportation corridor across the top of the escarpment. While it may take the pressure off of our specialty crop lands, it makes for new developments and impacts on natural heritage. It's all part of the Niagara Region and we want to make sure that we have policies to protect those areas. I am interested in knowing about practical policy statements from other municipalities or regions that have been used successfully that have been supported politically to protect the environment.

Disclaimer:

This transcription is our best effort from the tape recordings.

If the intent of your statement is incorrectly given here, please accept our apologies.

What are the model municipal land use polices for implementation? With a mid-Peninsula corridor, how can we continue to protect core areas and connect them across the landscape?

In the past year we have prepared draft natural heritage mapping and have prepared draft natural policies.

In the coming year we intend to finalize new environmental polices for inclusion in the regional plan based on Natural Heritage Systems and landscape approaches. We hope to see greater provincial involvement, guidance (technical comments) and perhaps the occasional appeal of a local decision that doesn't meet Provincial Policy.

Liz Gonser: I'm from London. I'm here today for several different reasons. I guess my first being as a citizen. A couple of years ago, our community became involved in the public process. We heard that a development was going to encroach on one of the ESA's here in London so we formed a consortium of associations to work with City Hall and to work with development consultants to try to find alternatives that were less environmentally unfriendly. The first reason I'm here is as a citizen. Secondly, I came as an Educator. I work for the Thames Valley Board of Education. One of the things that we are doing presently at the schoolyard is a naturalization project. We're trying to use native species to bring back urban wildlife on the schoolyard and we want to instill stewardship values in our students. The third reason why I'm here is that I'm in the Urban League of London and we have we have just been granted some money where an educator can educate the educator in terms of what Carolinian Canada is doing and what we can do in the educational system.

Andy Kenny: I worked in the past with Federation of Ontario Naturalists and Urban Forestry. I think, having said that, it should be really obvious why I am here. My role at FON is coordinator of Southern Ontario woodlands program and one of the main objectives there is to find and to build some networks and work with areas that have agencies and individuals to promote the concept of woodland conservation and restoration in Southern Ontario. At U of T, teaching urban and community forestry, we're looking at forestry issues right from the downtown core out into the rural environment. That's all crucial and fits into the planning process.

I would also be remiss if I didn't get a plug in for another meeting that is coming up in June. It's WoodsTalk. If you haven't heard of that, if you haven't signed up, meet me in the break and we'll pass some information on to you.

Sally Colman: I'm a District Planner with the Ministry of Natural Resources in the Aylmer District. Our district extends from Haldimand to Essex. We have a very large portion of the Carolinian Canada life zone in our District.

What I'm hoping to get from today is some feedback on how MNR at the local office can help municipalities move forward on natural heritage system planning. In our office, we have a GIS lab where it is possible to view the landscape remotely with technology such as satellite imagery

We want to know what do municipalities need to move this kind of

NHS planning forward. How can we assist municipalities to see the big picture and integrate that into their land use planning. We're hoping to move forward on piloting some of that satellite imagery technology and planning capability along with ecological land classification to be a part of planning for the natural heritage system.

In the past year we began piloting NHS-ELC for District Training with County of Middlesex to implement EIS guidelines (Terms of reference).

We will continue, across our district, to classify vegetation using ELC and will work with upper tier municipalities to increase their competency in addressing natural heritage within the planning process.

April Souwand, Environmental Planner City of Cambridge I have a question about the significance to assign to unevaluated wetlands that have been identified by MNR, but have no formal "status" or support.

One of our successes in the past year has been with stream rehabilitation projects on Moffat Creek where we removed an artificial waterfall and took two ponds off-line.

In the coming year we hope to develop a guideline document about environmental impacts for locally significant natural areas and about buffers for the natural heritage system.

Hal Schraeder, Ministry of Natural Resources I think one of the roles of the Ministry is to reduce uncertainty. They are presuming that we don't have enough. We see that soil, air and water is imperiled across the landscape. We advise that it would be prudent to keep the residue and look to restore or rebuild or create new features on landscape so the direct answer to the question about an unevaluated wetland is that it should be presumed to be significant in the absence of information to the contrary. That would save a lot of money, we can save a lot of effort and to help us move forward rather than get stuck in a gridlock situation about unnecessary evaluation. It seems to be clear to most people that we have a large challenge in front of us. We are trying to reconfigure land uses to achieve a 30% natural landscape and we have to find ways to expedite that.

A question for today is: "Can we demonstrate that NHS has utilitarian, "smart growth", infrastructure benefits that sustain and enable community growth and not simply aesthetic appeal?"

In the past year we provided information resources to enable applied Natural Heritage System management.

In the coming year we intend to continue to facilitate consideration of NHS at appropriate scales and to help planners make informed choices in the public interest: "Education" not "indoctrination"/acceptance not resignation.

Lionel Normand, Toronto Regional Conservation Authority:

The Toronto region is one of Canada's largest populations and I first started working for the Conservation Authority 8 years ago. Our jurisdiction is about 50% urbanized and the balance rural with about 17% natural cover. In the last 8 years I have seen an increase the urban proportion extending to Highway 7 to near Rutherford Road where I live and we are feeling the effects of the very large problem of urban sprawl.

In the last 5 years or so we have developed quite a rigorous program that we call the natural heritage approach. The emphasis that we have built that approach on is that we are not looking at the significance of an individual site but the significance of the whole natural system in the region. We count all natural systems including unevaluated wetlands and so called low quality habitats. We measure and evaluate the function of each habitat patch in relation to the function of the whole region. What we are suggesting is targets for health rather than trying to protect existing habitat and linkages. The difference between the City of Brampton and City of Uxbridge is enormous. Uxbridge could have 35% natural cover and Brampton would have only 5% using this approach. What we are doing is suggesting a scientific method for working at percent cover and distribution that will be a healthy system.

The other thing that we want to do with that model for a healthy system is to model land use changes beyond the limited planning horizon.

The reason that I am here today is to describe our approach, we want to first of all show our work to the scientific community, to get feedback and peer review from the scientific community and some backing and input for our approach. The second reason is to get decision makers like politicians and planners familiar with this approach; and, a third reason is to find an educational approach for these policy changes.

Bonnie Bergsma: Ecologist Planner with the City of London: Some of the things the City has is sub-watershed studies and very strong policies in our plan for natural heritage planning recognizing woodlands, wetlands, environmentally significant areas, habitat for vulnerable species and stream corridors. We have been successful at the Ontario Municipal Board in defending policies for significant woodlands for guidelines for evaluating the significance of woodlands.

We are working on rapid assessment techniques for evaluating woodlands and wetlands to prioritize them for protection. Although we may wish to protect them all, it may not be a realistic goal. Therefore, we are trying to comprehensively evaluate all of the vegetation patches in the City rather than leaving them to one-by-one assessment in response to development applications.

In the next year we are undergoing an Official Plan review and hopefully we will be able to bring some clarity to some of the policies that need clarification.

I really like the idea of developing targets. I think it is very, very difficult to know what should or shouldn't be protected unless you have got targets for what you are trying to achieve. Certainly, for storm water management there are water quality and water quantity objectives with specific yes or no responses if the target has been met. For the natural heritage system we don't have those numbers. One of the questions that I have is how to define net environmental benefits. Can we replace natural functions with artificial (engineered) structures and call it a net benefit to the system? What kind of trade offs can we make?

Maureen Jones: I'm with Aquafor Beech and we work with a lot of developers; but, we also work on watershed studies, so I'm involved with natural heritage from both sides of the fence. I find that one of the things that I get out of a conference such as this is ideas and hear how people are addressing issues, because, one of the most crucial things to me is how do you achieve a balance between all the diverse needs and expectations of all those involved in the development process and the natural heritage planning process.

Laurie Maynard with Canadian Wildlife Services I am with Canadian Wildlife of Environment Canada in London. I work on our migratory bird program, wetlands conservation and species at risk. We currently have a new program which is the habitat stewardship program for species at risk. It's a federally funded program that's administered by Environment Canada and is organized by three federal departments: the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Parks Canada, Environment Canada, and also the Ministry of Natural Resources. Currently we are in year two of our program and of course Carolinian Canada is a priority for species at risk conservation as well as expansion of habitat. Mostly, the species that are at risk in Ontario are at risk because of habitat loss and degradation. I am here today to learn, really, and I came last year and it was a great opportunity for us, as Federal Civil Servants to hear what has been going on at the ground level. As at any time we are designing a new program we need to have access to this expertise which we don't get.

There are a couple things I would like to flag for you. I think this is a good news story; with the Round Robin it's nice to hear some encouraging things and some of you may have heard about the Clear Creek forest which has now been secured. I think the exciting thing about that program is it is being initiated by a major conservancy in Canada. I don't know if anyone is here from the Nature Conservancy of Canada. The Clear Creek forest is an excellent example of conservation and the idea of expanding habitat that you need to conserve, not only of the species at risk, but the diversity of habitat that species need to live. Clear Creek forest, when it is fully integrated into the landscape, will be about 1,000 acres. It has been purchased and prevented from being clear cut and sold at market value and that was done through donations of several government agencies including Natural Resources and Environment Canada as well as apparently thousands of private citizens across the country. A couple of weeks ago I had the pleasure of going to the open house event and I encourage you to go on some of the tours that they are going to have at the site. It has a significant patch of what we would call "old growth forest" for Southwestern Ontario with trees upwards of 350 years old. It will become a satellite park for Rondeau Provincial Park on Lake Erie near Ridgetown. The NCC web site lists the tours. The local support for this site I think is really encouraging. Local municipalities, conservation authorities and landowners came forward to support this project. At the Open House 450 people attended and it poured rain. Scouts Canada planted 900 trees and it was really encouraging. I think if we can encourage others to get out and see some of these things it will go a long way. I think it is an encouraging example.

Just on a personal note, one of my interests is trying to find stronger alliances with agriculture. As Southwestern Ontario is the area of prime agricultural land I am interested in finding ideas and approaches to helping target the agricultural community. I think that we can identify common goals between agriculture and natural heritage planning. I'm not sure we're there yet. I know we have involved them in Carolinian Canada now, but I think we're trying to do the same things and prevent urban development, irreversible land conversion in some of the same areas. The idea of a long term planning horizon is very important.

Lisa Prime, Environmental Consultant at Marshall Macklin Monaghan

I came to Marshall Macklin Monaghan about a year and one-half ago; I used to be an upper tier municipal planner. I'm working on natural heritage policy and I am a giant supporter of it. I guess when I was a municipal planner the biggest hurdle was implementation. Now, I am looking for ways to how we can work together with both sides contributing to the natural heritage system.

What initiatives are taking place in Carolinian Canada with respect to applying Natural Heritage Policy and what is the success with implementation?

In the past year we worked on various land development projects trying to emphasize the importance of including natural heritage system components.

We plan to look for more opportunities and strategies for the implementation of natural heritage planning with municipalities and through developers

Brian Potter, Ministry of Natural Resources: I was one of the group that put together the Natural Heritage Reference Manual. I am very anxious to see what kind of reaction there is to it. I think that meetings like this are an excellent opportunity for various natural heritage practitioners to make some practical comparisons of what works and what doesn't.

Geoffrey Gartshore, Ecoplans Limited Kitchener, Private consultant (Region of Waterloo):

How are others finding the implementation of policy 2.3 in practical terms? Is the "Big Picture" considering a strategy for relative proportions of habitat types to guide municipalities, consultants and developers in prioritizing land use planning?

In the past year we provided environmental input to land use planning in both the public and private sectors throughout Ontario and other parts of Canada. This work often involves interpretation/implementation of the PPS Policy 2.3.

Ecoplans Limited is developing a National Road Salt Management Strategy for Canada. This initiative seeks to educate and to train municipalities in smarter use of road salt which has significant environmental and economic benefits.

I am an Ecologist. I guess the thing I'd like to raise is just some thoughts on the idea of land use planning and habitat assessment on the watershed level. As others here alluded to, sometimes the challenges that consultants

face is making decisions and providing advice to clients on land use planning priorities, habitat protection priorities and so on. Sometimes the challenge is because we have a finite amount of land to work with and sometimes the goal of absolute heritage protection is difficult to achieve.

One thing that might be useful, I think, is at perhaps a watershed level and at the municipal wide level that a greater emphasis be placed on sort of habitat assessment and banking. For instance, in the watershed zone how many hectares do we have of woodland, of prairie, cultural meadow, various types of wetlands, old field succession, tall shrub thickets, the whole mix. Then start to understand what relative proportions we have in the municipality. And then if you want to think about targets we could also assess what areas are above or below certain targets. We would then have something to work with because the challenge now is when land is getting tight in terms of making development land use decisions. There is more and more pressure and more and more thinking about open field habitat because of some conservation priorities. The challenge becomes, well, we often don't know at anyone time how much of these habitats we even have.

So, if we have to make trade off decisions, are we cutting into a land bank that we want to maintain, or do we have a large surplus of that particular type and therefore, in that instance that decision is perhaps okay. I think we are lacking that now and it might be useful if we could be thinking more about that. It will help everybody, I think, the developers included, to understand what the land bank is out there and in the municipalities as well, because obviously there will have to be compensation issues down the road in terms of what is kept and what is not kept. I think such a land bank inventory would be useful.

Winnifred Wake: I am a resident of London and I belong to a local branch of the Federation of Ontario Naturalists, McIlwraith Field Naturalists. My main interest today is to learn ways that we can effectively protect areas that are already officially protected. In the last 17 years that I have lived in London, I have seen the development of a good set of policies for establishing environmentally significant areas within the City. A number of these are now city-owned. The city-owned ones are, since I moved here, progressively degrading because of a very heavy amount of usage. Some of them have woodland trails that are ten or more feet wide. More and more people are seeing these large tracts as their rightful place to go to ride their off road bicycles.

We are also seeing proposals for roads through ESAs and interested citizens have to get up and raise a big stink to protect the ESAs that we have. There are some new initiatives right now for enforcement. But I think that maybe we are going to see some long term thinking in terms of the amount of pressure of public recreation, and ultimately accessible in this type of public environmentally significant areas as opposed to general use areas. I am interested in exploring with others in getting ideas in how we can maintain our ESAs in the long term. If we don't have some major changes on the ground then they can't be saved.

Bill: What I have heard so far is that there is a great mixture in the room. There are people representing the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and different agencies of the Government. Upper tier and lower tier municipalities. People representing naturalist organizations and members of the public at large. I think it is a good mixture of people to do the networking that we would like to see happen today. I heard many questions. I was surprised to hear some of the answers so quickly. April, you don't have to go just because Hal gave you answer that all unevaluated wetlands are significant and they should be regarded as significant. I'm sure you have more questions.

One of the things that I think should be in place is a consistency, so that no matter where you are in the Province, they have one Provincial Policy with respect to natural heritage issues and planning. I think that no matter which municipality you reside in, you should be afforded the same level of protection, the wetlands and woodlands and corridors should be protected in the same way regardless of where you are. And that the sort of range of planning should be the same time frame, not what can we do in the next year or maybe it's a five year review period or a 20 year review period. Don would like to have a 500 year vision of what the Big Picture could look like for Ontario or what the people in the Toronto Region Conservation Authority are doing for their centuries-long planning. I think that should be everywhere in the Province.

One of the questions I heard is: do we have to make trade offs, and how do we make those trade offs? In the answer from Geoffrey, we need to know what is represented on the landscape. We need to know what proportion of wetlands and woodlands and natural heritage linkages that exist and then we have some representation and some comparative values, and then we might be able to begin to look at trade offs. So you don't have to go home either Bonnie, there are more questions.

Providing environmental resource programming to students where that has been withdrawn from the curriculum. That is quite an amazing thing, I think. Again, that should be something wherever you go in the Province, that should be a minimum standard, a minimum expectation that our children will learn about the environment and natural heritage planning, specifically.

Don Gordon: One of the products of last year's conference was a set of proceedings which allows you to look back over what was said today. You can go, oh yeah, that was good, or how do I get a hold of this fellow or that woman. We put the proceedings together as we go here. We don't have a lot of set piece speeches that we are just going to reprint in them, and so the sheets that you have got in your kits that you fill in through the day will very much help us make a stronger reference for you when it's all over. We really look forward to that sort of participation. For those of you who don't have a copy of the proceedings of last year, it's available at the Carolinian Canada website and if you go to the conference page there you will also find a link to a very interesting document, that is hosted at the World Wildlife Fund of Canada's website, and that is an evaluation of municipal or official plan policies that are in place in Ontario currently. It was a survey of, I believe, upper tier municipality policy, so if you haven't

had a look at that, that's a tremendous place to start to see what kind of things are out there. If I remember the document correctly, it identifies the policies that are leading edge pathfinder policies and others that, perhaps, are lagging behind other municipalities.

Bill: Just to reinforce what Don said. As it says at the bottom of the yellow page on Round Robin reports, I'm asking you to hand them in. If you haven't finished making your scribble marks on them, you can do that later. It would be very beneficial to be able to have these and to try to put them together and into the document and there is a small survey (both yes and no) about what your municipality is doing about sub-watershed studies and official plan reviews. So we are interested in that as well. Any other comments at the moment.

Hal Schraeder: Last year at this time of the conference I spoke about elevating the natural heritage systems into a form of infrastructure that is supported and served by the communities. It might be partly contrived because as Bonnie said we can deal with the aesthetics of natural heritage systems, but we don't really know about their functionality, that is, how they are self-serving to us in sustaining our human ecosystems on the landscape. But I struggled a lot with the policy statements, that's my job. Now I'm here to ask a question. Are we committed to progressive rehabilitation of natural heritage systems? Are we going to continue down the road in terms of the compromised language that we use to effect palliative care? By that I mean, when we help the patient die with dignity we can find drugs to help the landscape feel good; but, at the end of the day the persistent pressure and desire for growth and settlement has got a trajectory, the legacy is clear. The Big Picture shows us the residue of what has happened to date and changing that cultural inertia is imperative. I remember back a few years ago the documents that spoke to changing development form. When we engage in compromised dialogue, I want to see something compromised from the other side, as well.

Muriel Andrae, St Clair Region CA: I would like to know which other municipalities have criteria for natural heritage areas, and for conducting environmental impact studies or development assessment reports?

In the past year we saw significant encroachment on a significant woodland, and proposals which will affect three other sites.

We intend to develop criteria, in cooperation with municipalities and obtain "buy in" to a natural heritage system in Middlesex County.

My question at is, when a specific development comes up and they say well there's 28% forest cover along this water course and there's more percent here than this township and that is a higher percentage than the county so it would be nice to have people saying something like saying "No, the goal for this watershed and this township and this county is a goal of ..." And that's the question, is the Big Picture saying shouldn't that goal be 30%? Thirty percent natural area cover or 30% natural area.

Don Gordon: Thirty percent natural coverage, yet I think we have to look at how we are going to define natural coverage and be even more inclusive system. We traditionally thought of protected areas and we certainly don't mean 30% of protected area. We are looking at ways that natural coverage can contribute in a working landscape. A simple example would be using advanced silvicultural techniques on woodlots so that they continue to play an economic role and their natural function is not impaired. So those are the balances we are looking for.

Muriel: I question whether there will be municipal support for saying 30% natural area coverage. When I'm asked to review an exception to the tree cutting bylaw and I say "you shouldn't cut this wood because the goal here is 10.5% forest cover in Middlesex County, the goal should be 30% natural cover is their political support for something like 30%.

Bill: Let me try to rephrase that question if I can, because this is not a political forum. The question is, how can the planners and the ecologists and the communicators communicate better? How can we package the information? How can we plant the right evidence and show and tell that story so that it is heard and understood by the people who are making the decisions? We have to think and understand about what the decision-making process is, and how to facilitate that decision-making process to lead to the decision that we would like to have. Is that okay to rephrase the question in that way?

Don: I want to get a little political on it, but, if you were to take a straw poll vote today, is there support for that measure? Well, no, not yet, but that's part of the approach of addressing different audiences, and among the audiences that Carolinian Canada is reaching out to, are those decision-makers, and the general population. This idea has got the percolate. We are trying to get across the idea of the need for a connected natural heritage system. People are beginning to accept that. Then you start to adjust the targets on top of that. Once they've got behind the idea that your natural areas have to be connected to each other for it to be viable, you have gone half the way right there, and then you can start to ratchet up the target. So what we need, too, is the evidence of success stories. One of the things that you hear are "oh well, you can't possibly do that; how can we have that much increase in natural area?" So we need to trot out the case of Norfolk where in the 1920s the place was blowing away and now it is the best forested portion of the entire region. So we come back from the brink. It's a process of engagement and that's one of reasons we are committed to it over a long period of time.

Brian: A big part of the secret is making a link between some of the utilitarian benefits and the biological merits of natural heritage features like wetlands, woodlands, valleylands and how they deliver important ecological functions such as groundwater recharge or floodwater control. I think we need to keep the natural heritage features on the landscape improving our water quality and quantity and maybe even some extent of quantifying those elements. We need studies that demonstrate not just

looking at what they provide directly but how they provide secondary benefits. What's the ecological value of groundwater by way of woodlands and wetlands? ...linking these natural heritage features with some of the secondary benefits and

Comment from the floor:what do you think the goal of 30%.... I think it would be really difficult to get the community to provide 30% across the board. Everybody thinks in terms of half property and 30% of half property and that is really what you're after. I think it is really important at the community level in putting together the natural heritage framework you have been talking about and looking at represented habitats and then look at specifics of how it's all linked together and it is probably a lot easier to get community buy-in to something that is specific like that as opposed to studying a target of 30% — people just can't get an image of what that would look like and many ... whether it might actually be achieved...

Chris Powell, Geography, University of Western Ontario

How successful have people's experience been with implementation?

I am working on my thesis about the implementation of storm water management (SWM) including the administrative, legal, financial and technological concerns. Specifically for the implementation of SWM in London but also elsewhere in Ontario with a view to showing the differences between theory and practice.

I'm here today to listen to and participate in discussion about implementation of policy and programs. I would like to see what people are doing for the implementation of policy and to know what happens in the field experience.

Teresa Bosco, City of Toronto How can we effectively implement NH policies? What are the elements of NH policies necessary to ensure effective implementation? How do we successfully go above and beyond the P.P.S.?

In the past year we have worked on a comprehensive natural heritage inventory/study to inform NH policies and an implementation strategy.

In the coming year we will adopt a new O.P. with progressive/cutting edge N.H. policies.

Laura von Zittaritz, City of Toronto We are completing background reports for new a new Official Plan and we are proceeding with a Campaign to Green Toronto.

Upper Thames River Conservation Authority We are offered the tools for natural heritage protection (PPS & some O.P.'s). How do we implement them?

In the past year we initiated the Middlesex County Natural Heritage Study working with five CA's who have jurisdiction in the county and MNR. In the Stratford area we initiated Drain Subwatershed Study. We also completed watershed report cards for our subwatershed (identified forest cover, fisheries, habitats). The subwatershed report cards can be used as base information to set "targets". Once targets are set, guidelines

and UTRCA polices can be developed and implemented to reach targets. The report cards also provide base information for future monitoring programs and evaluation of monitoring.

In the coming year we will continue to work on new policy(s) for wetland preservation and significant woodlot protection.

Angus Norman, Stewardship, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources

I'm interested in learning more about natural heritage and what other organizations are doing about it.

We will continue to educate stewardship councils and coordinators on natural heritage and will try to encourage greater involvement in these types of projects. Additionally, we'd like to strengthen our relationship with local municipalities.

Susan Keir, Keir Corp. (Consultants)

What are effective policies for implementation of the natural heritage system?

Tracey Etwell, Toronto, Gartner Lee- Markham

I want to know how natural heritage strategy can be applied soundly. I am just getting my feet wet in terms of being exposed to natural heritage systems. I am here to absorb as much as I can.

Nancy Pasato, City of London

I wonder how London is doing in terms of implementation and monitoring and how we can improve upon our polices.

I want to know how we might define "net benefit". Also, how should we monitor what we are doing, especially for the areas of implementation and monitoring.

David Cunningham, Grand River Conservation Authority

As a Resource Planner with the C.A., I deal daily with municipal staff, landowners, and politicians. After we have identified features, implemented policies, required studies, how can we be assured the feature will be saved and people educated?!

In the past year we commented on site specific planning application and provided input to update municipal documents; and, in the coming year we will continue to advance contacts with other practitioners.

Craig Cooper, Kettle Creek Conservation Authority

What specifically does the C.A. have to do to promote connectiveness? Especially with the smaller authorities?

In the past year we have completed a subwatershed study and are working on connecting woodlots throughout tree planting program.

In the coming year we intend to complete another subwatershed study, connect several woodlots and strive to educate the community about Natural Heritage.

Noah Goetz, Maitland Valley Conservation Authority

How are other organizations developing a Natural Heritage strategy and how do they make use of the PPS.

In the past year we continued to develop a Partnership Program to develop Natural Heritage Strategy. This program involves many different organizations within our watershed.

In the coming year we will finish developing the Natural Heritage Strategy and start to implement it on a watershed basis.

Chris Audet, Earth Tech (Canada) I wonder where are we going with significant woodlands in the Province?

In the past year we helped the City of London develop their significant woodlands guidelines and are engaged in developing a rapid assessment tool to do the entire system in London. This will become the baseline data to work with in identifying the quality and quantity of different features on the landscape. We will continue working with the City of London and other municipalities.

Gloria McGinn-McTeer, Urban League of London

We seem to have some of the strongest environmental policies in London, but have to make them work in the planning "real world". An issue of concern to us is the fragmentation between levels of government and within governments themselves.

In the past year the Urban League assisted at two OMB hearings: Reservoir Hill and the Stoney Creek Community Plan. Also, we visited the Ontario Municipal Board offices to voice concerns about lack of deference to council, public access to OMB and the consequent piecemeal planning under OMB guidelines.

On a positive note we helped urn asphalt into green space at the Memorial Garden Project.

In the coming year we will launch a speaker series in 2002 dealing with ethics, smart growth, environment. We will distribute David Suzuki tapes to both school boards through community associations to present their neighbourhood schools. In 2002 we will host a Transportation Conference dealing with issues of public transit, traffic demand management and lessening urban sprawl.

Wayne Scott, Town of Halton Hills

How to incorporate consideration of Natural Heritage in official plan development and use in our community?

In the past year we worked on the Willow Park Ecology Centre (Norval).

In the coming year we will prepare a draft and get approval for a plan to deliver further guidance documents for woodlot and forest management, slope protection and other ecological considerations.

Disclaimer:

This transcription is our best effort from the tape recordings.

If the intent of your statement is incorrectly given here, please accept our apologies.