

ECS Lunch and Learn Chat Log

December 15, 2021

[11:34 AM] Sharon Lam

Hi everyone, thank you for joining us! If you have any questions for Kelly and Noah, please feel free to type your questions in the Chat throughout the presentation.

[11:44 AM] Gavin Miller

Additionality: would this refer to situations where planting trees in a meadow in an existing protected area be proposed as a compensation offset?

like 1 laugh 1

[11:45 AM] Sharon Lam

https://s3-ca-central-1.amazonaws.com/trcaca/app/uploads/2019/11/27105627/TRCA-Guideline-for-Determining-Ecosystem-Compensation-June-2018_v2.pdf

like 1

[11:46 AM] Jackie Burkart

Principle 7 states that ideally a net gain or no net loss.... Do you mean "ideally an overall net gain but at a minimum, no net loss"?

like 2

[11:47 AM] Brad Stephens

wetland policy is 8.7.3

for those that want to brush up on their LCP knowledge

like 1 laugh 1

[11:51 AM] Jan Moryk

Wondering if time and mortality or survival is a factor considered in the concept of "Net gain". For example: if 10 young trees are used to replace 1 mature tree, how is the survival of those trees factored into the compensation protocol. Same thought process, how much time is needed for those trees to start having the same ecosystem function as that one mature tree that was lost.

like 3

[11:58 AM] Rebecca Spence

Jan Moryk I know that CVC uses TRCA's municipal forest studies and the i-tree-eco analysis by the USDA Forestry Service to get their values for individual tree replacement ratios and that considers ecosystem services like carbon sequestration and pollution removal.

like 1

[12:01 PM] Beth Williston

Thanks all ... next meeting is starting. Hope everyone has happy holidays!!

like 1

[12:01 PM] Noah Gaetz

to answer Gavin's question - planting trees or converting a meadow to a different habitat type would not be considered additional. Ideally all restoration should be located on lands outside of the existing natural heritage system

like 4

[12:04 PM] Paul Prior

Wondering whether compensation also includes those intact features that suffer diminished functioning due to the proximity of a development which doesn't directly remove habitat; for example, a previously undisturbed tract that subsequently becomes a "playground" and thereby loses a large extent of it's natural ecosystem "quality". ?

like 2

[12:05 PM] Noah Gaetz

To answer Jackie's question - each agency involved in compensation has a slightly different take on net gain versus no net loss. Some position it as "no net loss, ideally a net gain". others position it as "a net gain, at least no net loss"

like 2

[12:05 PM] Steve Heuchert

I've worked on several compensation agreements with Kelly. Anyone needing any assistance is welcome to contact me.

like 2

[12:06 PM] Jackie Burkart

Thanks Noah. What is TRCA's position on it?

like 1

[12:07 PM] Noah Gaetz

Paul - excellent question. Currently most compensation programs do not consider what you have outlined but I think this should be the next evolution so that indirect impacts are recognized and more effectively addressed.

like 5

[12:08 PM] Mary-Ann Burns

FYI, further to Brad's reference to 8.7.3, compensation policies in the LCP are: 7.4.2.1 c) and d) (for development), 7.4.4.1 l) and m) (for infrastructure), and 7.4.5.1 f) (for recreational use).

like 1

[12:08 PM] Andrew Chaisson

maybe when we're the proponent too

like 1

[12:09 PM] Noah Gaetz

Jackie - Here is the TRCA principle from the TRCA guideline "Compensation outcomes should strive to fully replace the same level of lost ecosystem structure and function in proximity to where the loss occurs, and where possible, achieve an overall gain"

like 2

[12:15 PM] Jackie Burkart

Over the LONG TERM, what is the success rate of the created wetlands that were "compensation" for loss of wetland feature? Wetlands have very specific requirements that may be difficult to replicate elsewhere in the field.

like 5 heart 1

[12:19 PM] Andrew Chaisson

FYI - new updates to MECP SAR exemptions

like 1

[12:19 PM] Sandra Spudic

Great presentation! Thank you

like 2

[12:22 PM] Amanda Stock

What are the best places for TRCA project management staff to start when planning a project which will require fish habitat offsetting as a condition of receiving a Fisheries Act Authorization permit from DFO? Do you have recommended resources to assist with creating offsetting plans for these kinds of projects?

like 4

[12:29 PM] Amanda Stock

That would be my team Just looking for any recommendations for future. Thanks for the answers everyone!

like 2

[12:30 PM] Andrew Chaisson

from a forestry perspective those 10 trees will probably result in 1 mature tree decades down the road.

[12:31 PM] Gavin Miller

Thanks everyone. I am going to need to be on my way. It was very informative.

like 1

[12:35 PM] Mark Rapus

Great presentation and discussion. Thank you!

[12:35 PM] Jackie Burkart

Great presentation. Thanks so much!

[12:35 PM] Sue Hayes

Thank you!

[12:35 PM] Rachel Holmes

Thanks for putting this together.

[12:35 PM] Elizabeth Speller

Thank you!

[12:36 PM] Andrew Chaisson

awesome, thanks!

[12:36 PM] Hillary Morris

that was great, thank you!

[12:36 PM] Rivka Shachak

Thank you

[12:36 PM] Amanda Stock

Thanks for the wonderful presentation!

[12:36 PM] Phil Wolfrain

Thank you!

[12:36 PM] Jessica Akande

Thank you! Great Presentation

[12:36 PM] Shaga Kokabi

Thank you!

[12:36 PM] Chris Cormack

Thank you

[12:38 PM] Kelly Jamieson

Hi Andrew, this is the concept behind the ratios that were developed within the Guideline to address time lag. We strive to plant enough trees today so that in 10 years the treed areas (basal area) is the same as the impacted site.

like 2

[12:43 PM] Andrew Chaisson

Yes, thank you. I figured as much, like you said that ensures the BA stays the same - as small trees, and eventually as a single biggie.