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This project, undertaken by Green Communities Canada (GCC) in partnership with Credit Valley Conservation (CVC), included event planning, promotion, preparation and distribution of an advance discussion paper, a one day workshop (1 March 2016) and follow-up. The project, funded by Places to Grow Implementation Fund of the Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, has been highly successful, exceeding targets and expectations.

Participants

Attendance at the one-day workshop, 1 March 2016 in Port Credit, totaled 135, including partner staff and trade show exhibitors. Exceeding our target of 100 by 35 percent.

We had an additional waiting list of 29.

Attendance on the day of the workshop was strong despite warnings of a major winter storm expected to hit the region beginning mid-day. Further, a feared mass exodus during the afternoon presentations failed to materialize.

As the attached list indicates, we were very successful in attracting the desired participant mix, including municipal staff with a variety of related responsibilities (including transportation and planning as well as stormwater management), municipal councillors, conservation authorities, consultants, suppliers and contractors, community organizations, environmental NGOs, and others. A show of hands indicated a mix of professions, including engineers, landscape architects, designers, and planners.

The participants closely matched the diversity of skills, perspectives, and roles needed for success in implementing green stormwater infrastructure in general and green streets in particular. No single player is positioned on their own to make this happen: experience shows that cross-sectoral collaboration is needed to get the right skill mix and broad base of support required to overcome barriers.

The partnership between Credit Valley Conservation and Green Communities Canada helped to ensure good attendance. Promotional outreach was extended to our complementary networks. CVC’s positive profile with municipalities and conservation authorities assisted in attracting participation from these sectors. Similarly, GCC is closely connected to the NGO sector and the Green Infrastructure Ontario Coalition.

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing had two representatives at the event, which was excellent and much appreciated. However, there was no representation from Ontario’s
environment or transportation ministries, nor CMHC, Environment Canada, or Infrastructure Canada. These and other senior government players will have an important role to play in supporting green streets implementation through research, capacity-building, policy, funding, and more.

**Advance paper**

A draft of the advance paper was included in the interim report. See the final version as circulated to participants is attached. The paper was intended to supply background information and prompt thinking about barriers and solutions to implementation of green stormwater infrastructure in rights-of-way. The quality and quantity of interaction during the table discussions suggests participants came prepared to address the questions of the day (see below).

**Program for the day**

GCC and CVC organized an excellent program for the workshop (See attached program. Presentations are available on request).

Robert Goo, an industry leader from the United States Environmental Protection Agency, traveled from Washington, DC to provide the keynote. Robert was the perfect choice. He was inspiring and visionary, positive and humorous, focused on the big picture backed up by decades of real-world experience, an industry leader. Robert urged workshop participants to de-emphasize stormwater in talking publicly about green streets—since stormwater is not a topic close to the hearts of all audiences—but instead to emphasize themes of aesthetic beauty, liveability, walkability, place-making, economic revitalization, and sustainability. “I am not in the stormwater business,” he said. “I am in the community development business. Green streets are multi-functional.” Robert cited several US cities that have restructured their internal bureaucracy to implement green streets. He said everybody is still learning how best to implement and maintain green streets. “We have to cooperate and hold each other’s hands.”

Scott Perry, City of Mississauga, outlined how his City came to embrace low impact development in the right of way, realizing that “business as usual is not good enough anymore.” Scott described various existing and planned Mississauga projects in active partnership with Credit Valley Conservation, which have “exceeded expectations” for performance, including peak as well as volume reductions.

Steve Grace, Halton Hills, described his experience with a “green community” subdivision spearheaded by a local developer, Intracorp. The project is designed to manage stormwater
onsite through a variety of measures, including “enhanced grass swales” along the roads, permeable paving, a bioswale, and downspout soak-away pits on most properties. Some modifications had to be implemented to correct initial problems, but monitoring to date shows that the system is “working well,” including much reduced volumes in a stormwater pond that was included in the design for redundancy.

John Nemeth, Peel Region, walked the room through a ten-step planning process to integrate green stormwater infrastructure into major regional roads from the beginning of the design stage. John noted that two-tier governments have somewhat confused the division of responsibility for stormwater management in rights-of-way, which needs to be clarified. An engineer himself, he said engineers need to get past attitudinal resistance—“I’m an engineer; I don’t need anybody”—and learn to collaborate with other professions. John expressed his conviction that it is technically feasible to absorb all runoff from regional roads within the right-of-way, even with “tight” soils. “Six to eight lanes all without the need for stormwater drains—it is possible!” he said.

Sheila Boudreau and Patrick Cheung, City of Toronto, presented on their work to develop green streets technical guidelines, which will be formally released at a multi-day event this November. Sheila (a landscape architect) and Patrick (an engineer) said they co-present to communicate the need for collaboration between the two professions and departments, as well as others. Patrick said wryly: “I had to learn what a tree needs to thrive. I am an engineer. It’s not in my training.” Sheila and Patrick spoke to the importance of “embedding” Green Streets (designing for stormwater management) in Complete Streets (designing for the needs of all users, including pedestrians and cyclists). They said there can be a good synergy between the two, and they are being coordinated in Toronto. The green street technical guidelines will include an Excel spreadsheet to help determine which infiltration landscaping measures are appropriate for which streets. They noted that road salts aren’t necessarily a barrier to green infrastructure, showing photos of two sets of street trees: one with watering by runoff, the other without. Notwithstanding salts, the trees with access to runoff are much larger and healthier in appearance than those maintained and watered under typical maintenance regimes.

**Table discussions**

In order to stimulate interactive discussion and thought, CVC and GCC included a long lunch, morning and afternoon networking breaks, and scheduled table discussions. Judging from the evaluation, the table discussions were among the most popular features of the day; and judging from the notes assembled from the sessions, they were also very productive.
Interestingly, the table sessions were cut short in order to get participants out the door before the storm. But this does not seem to have hindered the volume or quality of the discussion.

We organized a facilitator at each table to focus discussions on the top three barriers to implementing LID in the right-of-way, and solutions for each. Facilitators were supplied with prompt questions if the flow ebbed.

To cut time on the day in response to the threat of bad weather, we eliminated report-backs to the plenary. Possibly this adjustment enhanced the popularity of the discussions, because report-backs are generally scattered, repetitive, and long-winded. Our strategy to make the report-backs work was a good one: each table was to report only a single priority barrier and solution, with no repetition of barriers and solutions already presented. This is something worth trying in the future.

A ten-page summary of the table discussions is attached, organized thematically under the headings awareness and acceptance; costs and benefits; design; policy, regulations, and standards; operations and maintenance; performance; communication; marketing and promotion; tools, training and guidance. Three word clouds are provided:

- All discussion words,
- Words related to barriers
- Words related to solutions

The breadth of topics addressed in the table discussions is impressive. GCC and CVC will hold a debriefing and strategy session in the near future to consider the barriers and solutions in the notes and decide on next step. See below.

**Trade show**

CVC and GCC decided to provide for exhibitor booths as part of this event, primarily in order to ensure a broader range of perspectives in the room, accentuate the focus on practical solutions, and add interest to the breaks. This element was a great success. The room was lined with displays from suppliers, contractors, and consultants, including Ecosystem Recovery, Deeproot, Permacon, Aquafor Beech, WSP|MMM Group, Oaks, and Xeroflor. In addition, Credit Valley Conservation, Toronto Region Conservation, and Green Communities Canada all had tables that attracted lively interaction. $2,800 was raised to offset costs of a future event on similar topic for waitlisted people and follow-up meetings.
Partnership with Credit Valley Conservation

Credit Valley Conservation was a superb partner for Green Communities Canada, extremely friendly and accommodating, eager to help, and highly professional and competent. CVC did much of the heavy lifting on logistics for the event, mobilizing their workforce experienced in staging events of this time. Although an impressive team provided support, in particular, we want to acknowledge two individuals:

- Phil James, Manager of Integrated Water Management, led the CVC team in helping to plan and execute the event, including identification of an excellent program for the day
- Julie McManus, Corporate Services Assistant — Watershed Management organized logistics, and is personally responsible for the smooth running of the day's event.

Evaluations

Participant evaluations were very positive (see Workshop Feedback, attached). 56 per cent of respondents were highly satisfied with the event overall; 42 per cent were satisfied; and 2 per cent were neutral. Ratings were similar for the keynote, the presentations; the break-out session (table discussions), and the venue.

Almost seven in ten participants (69 per cent) said the information learned at the event will help them in implementing green streets in their community. Another 29 per cent said “maybe,” and only two per cent said “no.”

Comments suggest that participants were pleased with our approach to the workshop, i.e. a focus on real-world experiences, barriers, and solutions, with a diversity of perspectives among speakers and participants. They repeatedly use language like “applied examples,” “lessons learned,” “case studies,” “very practical,” and “best practices.” One respondent liked the fact that the discussions were less technical (i.e., designing of right-of-way measures) and “more based on how to start implementing these projects.” Another liked “specific examples of how it works from a planning, funding, and maintenance perspective.”

Respondents liked being part of an event with “various perspectives,” “diversity of opinion,” “multiple disciplines and backgrounds,” and “different people at the table.” They liked “connecting with industry people,” and “the opportunity to talk through barriers and generate solutions across disciplines.”

Surprisingly, many thought the break-out session (table discussions) was the most beneficial part of the workshop. A participant at one table started the conversation by declaring that
break-out sessions are “always a big waste of time.” But he went on to inspire an interesting exchange about his own favoured solution: the need for runoff reduction targets at a watershed scale that provide for the progressive implementation of low impact development over time. He said this framework is needed to drive right-of-way initiatives in new roads and reconstruction.

The evaluation comments include a great many ideas for topics to be covered in future—enough to fill a dozen events. They included discussions about policy and approval processes, implementation nuts and bolts, operational and maintenance challenges, road salt, LID performance, success in removing contaminants, public involvement, design and construction, stormwater user fees, and LID on private land. Additional comments:

- “Discussion of funding, maintenance of green streets. Placing a uniform policy throughout Ontario.”
- “Current legislation—provincial—what needs to change?”
- “create a permanent community of practice for knowledge-sharing, relationship-building, and telling success stories.”

Finally, other comments generally praised the event, the venue, and the food (including use of a green caterer). Mildly negative comments addressed the temperature of the venue (too cold?), the shortage of nearby parking, and the length of the event (“two days needed”).

We had only one real criticism, a respondent who thought the event needlessly repeated well-known barriers and solutions instead of making real progress on implementation. (For the most part it appears we did a good job of making everybody happy, regardless of their pre-existing level of sophistication, by planning a program that would be newcomer-friendly while incorporating detailed reports from the front lines. But it is certainly worth considering how future events and other activities could be structured to maximize forward motion.)

**Conclusions and follow-up**

The Roads and Runoff project met its objective of creating a high impact learning experience for diverse target audiences, including municipal decision-makers with responsibility for implementing green stormwater infrastructure in the right-of-way. Participants gained a better understanding of the practical issues surrounding implementation of road-side low impact development. A strong majority believe they learned information they can put to use locally in implementing green streets, and most of the rest think they might. The event was positive and exciting. It created momentum: people heard from their peers and others about progress in
individual projects that work, and progress in making right-of-way green infrastructure business as usual.

For Green Communities Canada, perhaps more than Credit Valley Conservation, the event was a wonderful opportunity to add some on-the-ground specifics to our bird’s eye view knowledge of green streets, in a Canadian context.

As part of the follow-up we are asking participants to subscribe to our monthly *Umbrella Stormwater Bulletin*, which features news and resources from the world of green stormwater infrastructure, including right-of-way implementation. We are also promoting our *Soak it Up! Toolkit*, which provides an overview of programs and policies for local implementation of green stormwater infrastructure across the landscape, again including rights-of-way.

The event more than confirmed our view that focussing the topic is a good engagement strategy. Instead of addressing green stormwater infrastructure in general, Roads and Runoff focussed on one category of application, the public right-of-way. Perhaps as a result we got a great response, including transportation department staff who would normally not attend an event about stormwater management. Future planned activities by Green Communities Canada will use a similar strategy, including a webinar for urban forest champions about the role of trees in intercepting and soaking up rain; a one day workshop for urban parks managers about increasing the hydrological function of parks while respecting and enhancing other uses; and a one-day forum on stormwater user fees and other market-based instruments for incenting runoff volume reductions on private property.

The project broadened and deepened the partner relationship between Green Communities Canada and Credit Valley Conservation, likely leading to other fruitful partnerships in future.

**Next Steps**

GCC and CVC will meet in the next month for a debriefing and strategy session. The agenda will include the possibility of collaborating on further events, but will also include other activities and strategies. Drawing from participant comments and our other work topics will include:

- **Engagement of senior government departments, provincial and federal.** How can they be more active players in facilitating green stormwater infrastructure in general and right-of-way implementation in particular? Potential targets include provincial ministries with responsibility for municipal affairs, transportation, environment, natural resources, and infrastructure. Federal government targets include CMHC and ministries with a similar range of responsibility. Given the federal and provincial commitments to support
infrastructure development financially it is particularly important that financing recognizes and supports “green” infrastructure as well as “grey.”

- **The provincial policy framework.** How can we ensure that the province’s stormwater volume reduction expectations in the LID Guidance Document will help drive green stormwater infrastructure implementation? For example, will these expectations apply to all road construction and reconstruction? (It would certainly have an impact if, for example, the province decides that it expects the first 25 mm of rain to be managed onsite, through source controls.) Further, can the requirement for water sustainability planning under the Water Opportunities Act be a driver for integrated watershed planning and management, and therefore for LID implementation?

- **Community of practice.** Credit Valley Conservation and Toronto Region Conservation are providing training and detailed research and technical information. Green Communities Canada publishes the *Umbrella Stormwater Bulletin*, and is promoting the *Soak it Up! Toolkit*. Are there nevertheless gaps in available information and communications channels? We note the role of the US EPA in supporting a Green Infrastructure Collaborative: “a network-based learning alliance created to help communities more easily implement green infrastructure.” Does Canada/Ontario need something similar?

- **Research.** Some participant comments referenced the need for more science-based information about LID performance, maintenance, cost-effectiveness, and particular issues like road salt. LID performance in the Canadian climate and tight soils (clay) is a perennial issue. Is there a gap in Canadian research on this topic? Or is there adequate research but a need to “mobilize” this knowledge for target audiences (i.e., translate, communicate).

- **Local implementation.** A number of the comments related to aspects of local implementation, including policy, process, staffing/structure, and partnerships. Would this be a good focus for a workshop?

- **Public engagement.** Some participants saw public understanding, buy-in, and participation in source control solutions as a top priority. Would this be a good focus for another event?

These and other topics will be addressed at a debriefing/strategy session involving GCC and CVC (and possibly others) in the very near future. We would be pleased to inform MMAH of the outcome or involve the Ministry in strategy discussions.
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# Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 9:00 a.m.</td>
<td><strong>Registration and Refreshments</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:00 – 9:20 a.m. | **Welcome:**  
Clifford Maynes, Executive Director Green Communities Canada  
Tim Mereu, Director of Watershed Management, Credit Valley Conservation |
| 9:20 – 10:15 a.m.| **Keynote Address:**  
*Using Green Infrastructure to Enhance Public Right-of-ways*  
Speaker: Robert Goo, USEPA                                       |
| 10:15 – 10:45 a.m.| **Break**                                                              |
| 10:45 – 12:15 p.m.| **Panel Presentation: Implementing Green Streets**                     |
|                  | Speakers:                                                              |
|                  | • *The Evolution of Green Streets in Mississauga*  
Scott Perry, Storm Drainage Coordinator, City of Mississauga |
|                  | • *Lessons Learned, Residential Subdivision and Low Impact Development*  
Steve Grace, Town of Halton Hills                                 |
|                  | • *Ten Step Process of Regional Road Design, Incorporating LID*  
John Nemeth, Infrastructure Programs and Studies, Region of Peel   |
| 12:15 – 1:30 p.m. | **Lunch and Networking**                                             |
| 1:30 – 2:30 p.m. | **Breakout Discussion**                                               |
|                  | Participants will work with a facilitator at their table to answer the question:  
*From your perspective, what are the top three barriers to green street implementation in your community? How can these be addressed?* |
| 2:30 – 3:00 p.m. | **Break**                                                              |
| 3:00 – 3:50 p.m. | **Presentation**  
*Toronto Green Streets Building a Resilient City Through Green Infrastructure*  
Shelia Boudreau, Urban Designer, City of Toronto  
Patrick Cheung, Senior Engineer, City of Toronto            |
| 3:50 – 4:00 p.m. | **Final Remarks:**  
Green Communities Canada and Credit Valley Conservation               |
About Our Speakers

**Jon MacMull - Master of Ceremonies**

Credit Valley Conservation

Jon is Supervisor, Marketing and Communications for Credit Valley Conservation. He leads outreach campaigns focused on community engagement and partnership building.

**Robert Goo Keynote Speaker**

USEPA

Robert Goo currently works USEPA in the Office of Water. His areas of concentration include: integrated water resource management, water sensitive urban design, voluntary codes and standards such as LEED, SITES and the International Green Construction Code. He has over 25 years of experience promoting decentralized stormwater and wastewater treatment systems and green infrastructure/low impact development practices. Robert helped develop the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater regulations under the Clean Water Act and works actively to promote the development of policies and programs that are intended to protect and restore watersheds. In the past he worked on a variety of other issues including biosolids management, the water energy nexus, rangeland management and voluntary environmental.

**Scott Perry City of Mississauga**

Scott has been employed with the City of Mississauga for the last 9 years in various storm drainage positions. Currently, he’s the Storm Drainage Coordinator with the City’s Environmental Services Section. In this role, his focus has generally been on stormwater management, including the inventory of stormwater management facilities and prioritizing their sediment removal. More recently, he has been involved with the coordination of the City’s road LID projects.
**Shelia Boudreau**  
City of Toronto  
Sheila is a landscape architect and urban designer in City Planning at the City of Toronto. Her work is city-wide and includes developing guidelines and standards, designing and constructing capital works projects (innovative pilot projects), coordinating interdivisional/multidisciplinary working groups, community outreach, and the initiation and development of the Street Tree Triple-Bottom-Line Benefit-Cost Analysis project as well as the Adopt-a-Street-Tree program. As co-lead on the Green Streets Technical Guidelines project with Toronto Water (construction standards for green infrastructure in the right-of-way, to meet Toronto Green Standards objectives), Sheila strives to integrate best practices in planning and designing a more resilient and vibrant city. Sheila also represents the Ontario Association of Landscape Architects on the Green Infrastructure Ontario Coalition, and City Planning on the Toronto Cancer Prevention Coalition / Toronto Public Health’s Shade Policy Committee (advocating for natural shade through sustainable tree planting).

**Patrick Cheung**  
City of Toronto  
Patrick Cheung is a senior engineer in the Policy and Program Development unit of Toronto Water. He has over thirty years of experience in municipal infrastructure servicing engineering field. He is currently co-leading the development of Toronto’s Green Streets Program (the implement of the Toronto Green Standard in the right-of-way). Patrick has provided input into a number of City of Toronto guidelines, studies and programs such as the Avenues and Mid-Rise Study, Toronto Green Standards, Greening Surface Parking Lots Guidelines, Tree Planting in Hard Surfaces, Development Infrastructure Policy and Standards Review and Complete Street Guidelines.

**John Nemeth**  
Region of Peel  
John is a graduate of Ryerson University and has over thirty years’ experience in the land development business focusing on the design, implementation, operations and maintenance of stormwater infrastructure and its role to both service the land and protect the environment. As chair of the National Benchmarking Initiative Stormwater annual Workshop and the Southern Ontario Municipal Stormwater Discussion Group he has had the opportunity to participate in national and provincial exercises to improve stormwater practices and contribute to policy frameworks put forth to protect the environment.

**Steve Grace**  
Town of Halton Hills  
Steve Grace, C.E.T., is the program Manager Water Resources for the Town of Halton Hills where he is responsible for over-seeing the review, approval and Town’s technical requirements of Storm Water Management initiatives. In addition, Steve provides the technical lead on subdivision and site plan review, inspection, administration and any requirements associated with Source Water Protection. Prior to joining the Town of Halton Hills in 2000, Steve was employed for 26 years in the private sector with a local Consulting Engineering firm.
Roads and Runoff:
Implementing Green Streets in the Greater Golden Horseshoe

March 1, 2015
Port Credit Ontario
**WELCOME TO** a discussion paper prepared for participants in the Roads and Runoff workshop, 1 March 2016, in Port Credit, Ontario. The paper is being circulated as advance reading to "prime the pump" by providing background and introducing potential barriers and solutions for consideration.

Green streets, which manage road runoff in the right-of-way through filtration, infiltration or evapotranspiration have many benefits, but require a significant change of practice and culture. The paper invites participants to think about the drivers for managing road runoff in public rights-of-way and how to accelerate implementation of measures to reduce stormwater volumes and runoff pollution. At the workshop we will share our ideas in order to create a road map for moving forward. This road map will be shared with participants and key decision makers following the workshop. Our aim is that green streets will become business as usual in road construction and reconstruction in the Greater Golden Horseshoe Area and across the province. This will be done by addressing barriers and incentives to implementation at all stages – from planning, to design, to construction, to maintenance.

This paper has been prepared by Clara Blakelock and Clifford Maynes of Green Communities Canada. Please direct comments and questions to info@raincommunitysolutions.ca.

Roads and Runoff is a project of Green Communities Canada, in partnership with Credit Valley Conservation.

Thanks for financial support to the project from the Places to Grow Implementation Fund of the Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

---

**QUESTION TO CONSIDER FOR DISCUSSION AT THE WORKSHOP:**
From your perspective, what are the top three barriers to the implementation of green streets in your community? How can these be addressed?

---

**Contents**

- **Introduction.** A brief overview of the issue of roads and runoff.
- **Green streets.** Summary of green streets technologies and opportunities. Examples of specific projects and municipalities in Canada and the U.S. which are embracing the concept.
- **The Ontario policy context.** How provincial legislation supports the use of green infrastructure in rights-of-way and beyond.
- **Barriers and solutions.** Opportunities and challenges for the implementation of green streets.
Introduction

Urbanization, climate change, and green infrastructure

URBAN AREAS are covered in hard surfaces – buildings, parking lots, driveways, and roads. When a forest or meadow becomes a city, the increase in impervious area interrupts the water cycle and greatly increases runoff volumes and peaks. Climate change further heightens volumes and peaks by increasing the incidence of extreme wet weather events.

Impacts include urban and riverine flooding, erosion, altered water balance (which impacts stream base flows) and loss of groundwater recharge. Increased runoff and loss of natural filtration -- and in some locations combined sewer overflows -- results in pollution, which can affect aquatic ecosystems, recreational uses, and source water for drinking.

Part of the answer to the problem of urbanization and climate change is to restore and mimic the natural water cycle through a combination of natural and constructed features known variously as green infrastructure (GI), low impact development (LID), stormwater innovations, etc.i Measures to manage rain where it falls and reduce stormwater volumes can include rain gardens, bioswales, permeable pavement, urban trees, and infiltration trenches.ii

Many US cities are investing hundreds of millions of dollars or more in green infrastructure to manage stormwater, and adopting policies and programs to mobilize private investments. Canadian cities are also beginning to use this approach.

Roads and runoff – problems and solutions

There are nearly 200,000 km of two-lane equivalent roads (paved and unpaved) in Ontario,iii creating over 1,100 km² of impervious surface.iv Twenty-five millimeters of rainfall across the entire road network generates over 25 billion litres of stormwater runoff, and millions of kilograms of pollution. Roads have been found to produce as much as 80 per cent of stormwater pollutant loading in urban areas.v

Roads and runoff – problems and solutions

There are nearly 200,000 km of two-lane equivalent roads (paved and unpaved) in Ontario, iii creating over 1,100 km² of impervious surface.iv Twenty-five millimeters of rainfall across the entire road network generates over 25 billion litres of stormwater runoff, and millions of kilograms of pollution. Roads have been found to produce as much as 80 per cent of stormwater pollutant loading in urban areas.v

Road-related pollution found in stormwater includes oil, grease, metals and chemicals from vehicles, road salt, and sediment. In summer months, thermal pollution can be a major concern in areas with sensitive species in receiving streams.

In urban areas, rain is generally removed from roads through storm drains and underground pipes, and discharge directly to waterbodies. Alternatively, in more recently developed areas, rain is drained to stormwater ponds, where it is held before being discharged, and some level of treatment is provided. Roadside ditches designed for conveyance perform this function in older and more rural areas.

However, there is a growing understanding that these methods do not adequately treat the pollution from roads, nor do they restore the natural water balance, maintain groundwater recharge or pre-development stream flows. Many of these systems are aging and were not designed to accommodate increased volumes due to
urbanization and climate change, resulting in flooding that can cause damage to roads themselves, homes, businesses and nearby infrastructure. Even up to date systems using conventional pipes and ponds cannot meet targets for quantity and quality control, and thermal pollution from stormwater ponds can shock receiving streams. Hence the emphasis on innovative green infrastructure that manages rain where it falls.

Part of the solution is to implement green infrastructure in rights-of-way. This makes sense given the contribution of roads to runoff and pollutant loadings, and the opportunity to implement green infrastructure on public property during road construction and reconstruction.

**Green Streets**

The “green streets” approach has been used with great success in pilot projects, and on a wider scale across the urban landscape in some U.S. cities. These streets either replace or supplement traditional grey stormwater infrastructure with green infrastructure installed in the road rights-of-way – practices such as permeable paving, bioretention, urban trees or infiltration galleries. Green streets can be implemented in new development, or as part of retrofits to upgrade stormwater systems or roads. See video for some examples of green streets installations.

Green streets can provide volume reductions and quality improvements in high density urban areas where land is scarce and very expensive. Because of the incorporation of trees and other vegetation, co-benefits include carbon sequestration, improved air quality, and urban heat island mitigation.

*Silva cells help to green Central Parkway in Mississauga, Ontario.*
Source: Credit Valley Conservation

Green streets can also support active transportation and complete streets. For example, bump outs which narrow roadways at pedestrian crossings to slow traffic flow can also function as bioretention systems. Healthy, mature street trees provide shade to sidewalks, making walking more pleasant for pedestrians. Sidewalk planters also create more walk-friendly environments.

A study conducted in Burnsville, Minnesota on rain gardens in residential rights of way demonstrates how effective these techniques can be. Monitoring of two adjacent neighbourhoods, one of which had 17 rain gardens installed in rights-of-way, showed the rain gardens were able to reduce runoff volumes by 90% compared to the control neighbourhood.

Burnsville Stormwater Retrofit Study, 2006
http://www.ci.burnsville.mn.us/DocumentCenter/Home/View/449
Green streets project examples

At the workshop on 1 March, speakers will provide first-hand accounts of how some green streets projects came to be built in the Greater Golden Horseshoe Area, and how they have been performing. Below are a few other examples.

The Lakeview project developed by the City of Mississauga and Credit Valley Conservation took place in a residential neighbourhood draining directly to Lake Ontario, where stormwater management consisted of deteriorating ditches and culverts. Bioretention and permeable paving were installed in the rights-of-way of 285 m of roadway. Lakeview is considered Canada’s first green street, and a number of lessons were learned about engaging residential property owners adjacent to the projects, construction best practices, and landscaping.

In the Elm Drive LID retrofit, also developed by City of Mississauga and Credit Valley Conservation, six bioretention planters were installed on Peel District School Board property adjacent to the right-of-way, while permeable pavers were installed in the municipal right-of-way. The system was designed to take runoff from the road, filter it through the permeable pavement, and channel it into the bioretention planters.

The Elm Drive project has been monitored since its installation in 2011, and it has been found to virtually eliminate runoff and pollution for 90 per cent of annual rainfall events. It has even performed well in extreme weather events that go well beyond its design specifications. During the 8 July 2013 storm in Mississauga, in which 105mm of rainfall fell over five hours, the installation reduced volumes by 30 per cent and peak flows by 60 per cent. Peak flows were delayed by 20 minutes. See the case study and full monitoring report.

The City of Kitchener developed the King Street project with the primary goal of creating a more pedestrian-friendly downtown. The design, which won the International Community Places Award in 2010, also incorporated several green street elements, including bioretention planters that collect road runoff, and 120 street trees. Because Kitchener relies on groundwater for its drinking water needs, the bioretention planters provide a significant buffer zone against stormwater.
water, the bioretention units were designed to be shut off during winter months to reduce the risk of contaminating drinking water supplies with road salt.

**Green streets at a community scale**

Cities in both Canada and the U.S. are now overcoming the barriers faced by road right-of-way green infrastructure projects and proceeding to implement projects at a community-wide scale.

Mississauga City Council passed a resolution in 2014 to consider the use of low impact development for stormwater management in every road reconstruction project.xii

The City of Toronto is currently developing Green Streets Technical Guidelines for the implementation of green streets during road construction and reconstruction, to comply with Toronto’s Green Standard. The Green Streets guidelines will be designed to work in conjunction with the Complete Streets guidelines, also in development. Sheila Boudreau of the City of Toronto will provide further details on the status of this project at the workshop on 1 March.

In the U.S., several cities are already implementing green streets at a broad scale. New York City’s Green Infrastructure Plan, released in 2010, includes a standardized approach to green infrastructure in rights-of-way. The City is tendering area-wide contracts to achieve economies of scale. Each contract consists of approximately 100-200 bioswales over ten green streets. As of the end of 2014, 866 right-of-way projects were under construction.xiii

Philadelphia’s Green City, Clean Waters program is designed to eliminate combined sewer overflows through the use of green infrastructure. Streets and sidewalks make up 38% of the impervious cover in the combined sewer area of the city.xiv In 2014, Philadelphia Water released a Green Streets Design Manual that works in conjunction with the Philadelphia Complete Streets Design Handbook, published by the Office of Transportation and Utilities. Over 200 green streets projects have been constructed or are in design in Philadelphia.xv

Other cities with extensive green streets programs include Washington D.C.xvi (which will be highlighted at our workshop on 1 March), Portland, Oregon, xvii Milwaukee, xviii and Seattle.xix

**The Ontario Policy Context**

ALTHOUGH IN theory, going back at least as far as the 2003 Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual,xx source controls (green infrastructure/LID) were encouraged in Ontario, in practice industry standards and approvals have favoured conventional pipes and ponds. In recent years, the Ontario government has acknowledged that conventional methods of managing stormwater are unable, by themselves, to achieve
Stormwater runoff is a major source of pollution to surface waters, in the Great Lakes Basin and beyond. Urbanization also impacts water quantity – reducing the water that is absorbed into groundwater aquifers and increasing surface flows to streams.

“…natural systems provide low-cost adaptation solutions. For example, wetlands can provide effective stormwater management services and help mitigate the impacts of extreme weather on infrastructure such as storm sewers.”

Ontario Climate Change Strategy, 2015

Despite increased policy support for green infrastructure/LID, progress in implementation has been slow. In a 2014 report, the Environmental Commissioner of Ontario sharply criticized the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) and other ministries for inaction on implementing new approaches to stormwater management.

However, it appears that the tide is turning. In February 2015 MOECC released a strongly worded interpretation bulletin on stormwater management policy which stated: “the natural hydrologic cycle should be maintained to the greatest extent possible” by managing rain where it falls. In other words, source reduction is now the province’s top priority for stormwater management, and green infrastructure may even be able to reduce the need for conventional...
methods. This bulletin acknowledged that current approvals processes do not always support this innovative approach.

Work is now under way by MOECC to develop a Low Impact Development guidance manual, due for completion in 2016. The manual will outline the process and expectations for incorporating green stormwater infrastructure. Importantly, it will establish provincial targets for stormwater volume reduction. For example, many leading jurisdictions in the U.S. and Canada have adopted a target of 25 mm (1") or more for managing rain onsite, which means that the first 25 mm of runoff must be eliminated through onsite infiltration, evapotranspiration, and harvesting and reuse.

The Ministry has stated that its LID guidance and volume reduction targets will apply across the landscape -- which presumably includes road development and re-development projects.

Barriers and Solutions

Despite all the benefits, demonstration projects, and policy support, green streets are still not business as usual for road construction and reconstruction in Ontario. Through discussions with stakeholders, we have identified several barriers that we believe contribute to the lack of uptake. We also suggest possible solutions where they can be identified. At the 1 March workshop we will expand upon these barriers and solutions with your input, and identify priorities for action.

Barriers

Lack of awareness
Municipal decision-makers and managers may not even consider the potential for integrating green stormwater infrastructure in rights-of-way, and resulting benefits.

Concern about performance
May include:
- belief that soil conditions cannot support infiltration
- lack of trust in ability of green stormwater infrastructure to manage runoff on a large scale
- winter performance

Concern about costs
Many studies have shown that green infrastructure (or a grey-green combination) is cheaper than grey infrastructure alone. However, in initial stages, higher costs may actually occur in some cases. For example:
- increased planning and design time for incorporating new technologies
- lack of locally available materials
- lack of local capacity for construction and maintenance

Concern about groundwater/drinking water contamination.
Some communities are concerned about the risk to groundwater resources posed by infiltrating polluted stormwater.

Bioswales and permeable pavement in front of new development homes in Brampton, Ontario.
Source: Credit Valley Conservation
Concern about maintenance. Communities are concerned about perceived increase maintenance requirements for vegetation and planters to retain infiltration capacity.

Lack of capacity. Capacity development of municipal staff, consultants, and contractors may be required at every stage:
- planning
- design
- construction
- maintenance

Lack of champions. Green streets may lack a champion on staff who is able to convince others.

Local regulations and standards. Municipalities may have established reconstruction that exclude or even discourage infiltrating runoff. Examples include:
- minimum road width and parking requirements that reduce space for green infrastructure
- grey infrastructure requirements that do not allow for reduced sizing with the inclusion of green infrastructure

Design challenges. These may include:
- limited space
- tight soils
- other infrastructure in the rights-of-way
- other uses of rights-of-way

Communication/coordination between different departments. Departments within a municipality that need to be involved in a green infrastructure right-of-way project include:
- planning
- engineering
- parks/landscaping
- public works
- stormwater

These departments often operate in completely different spheres, and may not be used to coordinating budgets, construction, maintenance etc. between them.

Responsibilities divided according to level of government. Upper tier (regional) governments are responsible for regional roads and stormwater on regional properties in some areas, while lower tier (municipal) governments are responsible for municipal roads and stormwater. Coordination between these levels of government can be challenging.

Lack of standardized decision-making, approval and review processes. This can include:
- Lack of direction and strategic planning from high level decision makers
- Lack of design criteria, standards and specification
- No standard review processes
**Solutions**

**Promotion.**
Hold conferences, workshops. Create communities of practice for knowledge-sharing with provincial/federal support, multi-sectoral collaboration. Educate key stakeholders to overcome common myths.

**Research and documentation.**
Compile and share data about the effectiveness of green streets, construction and maintenance costs, and managing runoff for ground and surface water protection.

**Training and guidance.**
Provide information resources, technical guidance, and formalized training for planners, engineers, approvals staff, construction staff and maintenance staff.

**Provincial regulation.**
Adopt provincial requirements/targets for onsite stormwater infiltration in all developments/redevelopments, including roads. Ensure that standards do not require superfluous grey infrastructure – some of the biggest cost savings of green infrastructure come from reduced need for underground pipes and reduced sizing of ponds.

**Local regulations and standards.**
Review the local policy and approvals framework to ensure alignment with green streets. See the USEPA “water quality scorecard” as a model. Do we need a similar guide for Ontario, including a section addressing green streets?

**Market development.**
Once there is a market for LID/green infrastructure, costs have been shown to lower dramatically (Chicago saw the cost of permeable concrete go down by 2/3 in six months once they started installing it in all alleyway retrofits). So committing to widespread implementation of green streets is one way to lower costs.

**Systematic approaches**

**Diverse project teams**
Successful right-of-way projects include project teams with representatives from all the relevant departments from the beginning so that issues can be worked out from the start.

**Integrated water management**
A “one water” approach which considers stormwater, drinking water and waste water as part of one system at a watershed scale can help to break down barriers between departments and levels of government.
Question to consider before the workshop

There will be time dedicated during the workshop to coming up with solutions. However, because time is limited, we hope you will take some time in advance of the workshop to gather your thoughts on the following question so that discussions will be as productive as possible.

From your perspective, what are the top three barriers to the implementation of green streets in your community? How can these be addressed?

About Green Communities Canada

Green Communities Canada, founded in 1995, is a national organization that works with its member organizations and partners to implement practical community solutions for environment, health, infrastructure, and economy. We deliver RAIN Community Solutions and related programs like Depave Paradise to help implement green stormwater infrastructure.

About Credit Valley Conservation

Credit Valley Conservation (CVC) is a leader in green technologies and has worked in collaboration with over 30 partners (including member municipalities, development community, local businesses, residents, Conservation Authorities and Ministries) to implement innovative green infrastructure practices like bioretention within municipal right of ways to manage stormwater runoff and improve the quality of water that enters receiving waterways.
Note — green infrastructure can refer to other services provided by natural systems outside of stormwater services. For the purposes of this paper, green infrastructure (GI) and green stormwater infrastructure (GSI) will be used interchangeably. Other commonly used terms include Low Impact Development (LID), stormwater innovations, source controls, best management practices, sustainable urban drainage systems and water-sensitive urban design.

Green infrastructure also includes wetlands and other natural systems as well as green roofs and rainwater harvesting. However, these are not applicable to road rights-of-way. For more information on types of green infrastructure in road rights-of-way, see Grey to Green Road Retrofits: Optimizing Your Infrastructure Assets through Low Impact Development, Credit Valley Conservation, p 4. http://www.creditvalleyc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Grey-to-Green-Road-ROW-Retrofits-Complete_1.pdf


This assumes (conservatively) a two-lane road width of 6m.


Complete streets refer to streets designed for all ages, abilities, and modes of travel. See Complete Streets for Canada. http://completestreetsforcanada.ca/


See for example, Greater Sudbury Source Protection Plan, p 38.
https://www.greatersudbury.ca/sudburyen/assets/File/Greater_Sudbury_Source_Protection_Area_Approved_SPP_Sept_19.pdf and Source Protection Plan for the Niagara Peninsula Source Protection Area, p 32


Provincial Policy Statement, 2014,
http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page10679.aspx. See in particular Policy 1.6.6.7. Interestingly, Policy 2.2.1 requires that "planning authorities shall protect, improve or restore the quality and quantity of water by ensuring stormwater management practices minimize stormwater volumes and contaminant loads, and maintain or increase the extent of vegetative and pervious surfaces." Since virtually all development reduces vegetative and pervious surfaces, this policy would appear to ban development in the province of Ontario.

https://www.placetogrow.ca/content/ggh/2013-06-10-Growth-Plan-for-the-GGH-EN.pdf


MOECC Interpretation bulletin re stormwater management (2015).

See several studies cited on the USEPA Green infrastructure cost-benefit resources webpage.
http://www.epa.gov/green-infrastructure/green-infrastructure-cost-benefit-resources

See Credit Valley Conservation. Common perceived barriers to LID and how to overcome them.

Research by the Sustainable Technologies Evaluation Program shows infiltration in tight soils is possible if measures are well-designed. While there may be specific sites where infiltration is not possible, it is not likely to be widespread across an entire urban area. See Young, D. (2015). Go Deep – making infiltration work in tight soils.

There are also strategies available for pollution prevention and mitigating risks to groundwater –keeping in mind that pollution currently flows into surface water. BC Ministry of Environment (2014). Underground stormwater infiltration: best practices for the protection of groundwater in British Columbia.


https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/publicroads/10mayjun/05.cfm

Credit Valley Conservation. Grey to green road retrofits: optimizing your infrastructure assets through Low Impact Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Home City</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Reinthaler</td>
<td>King City</td>
<td>Sr. Associate</td>
<td>Schaeffers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>Pleasance</td>
<td>Courtice</td>
<td>Water Efficiency Coordinator</td>
<td>Region of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Kerr</td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>Client Project Manager</td>
<td>DSEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Schaeffer</td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>Client Project Manager</td>
<td>DSEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>McLean</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Fieldgate Developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Vandezande</td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>Manager - Growth Policy and Research</td>
<td>City of Markham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVE</td>
<td>CHIPPS</td>
<td>BURLINGTON</td>
<td>ASSOCIATE ENGINEER</td>
<td>AMEC FOSTER WHEELER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Environmental Specialist</td>
<td>Region of York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>Rabicki</td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>City of Markham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>Manager, Roads Operations</td>
<td>City of Markham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>Manager, Parks Operations</td>
<td>City of Markham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Porretta</td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>Acting Manager, Business &amp; Technical</td>
<td>City of Markham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Lucyk</td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>Public Realm Coordinator</td>
<td>City of Markham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>Supervisor, Parks</td>
<td>City of Markham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Busato</td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>Supervisor, Parks</td>
<td>City of Markham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Shields</td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>Supervisor, Forestry</td>
<td>City of Markham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>Design and Construction Project Manager</td>
<td>Matt Wilson - City of Kitchener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Brantford</td>
<td>Transportation Technologist</td>
<td>City of Brantford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Dougherty</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Manager Water Quality Protection</td>
<td>Credit Valley Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leanne</td>
<td>Collett</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Watershed Stewardship Technician</td>
<td>Hamilton Conservation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrina</td>
<td>Fischer-Patterson</td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Water Resources Engineer</td>
<td>Conservation Halton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>Brickman</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Engineering Technologist</td>
<td>Samantha Brickman/Engineering Technologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britt</td>
<td>McKee</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Sustainability Education Program Manager</td>
<td>Ecosource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Dickhout</td>
<td>Hagersville</td>
<td>Development and Design Technician</td>
<td>Haldimand County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leanne</td>
<td>Knuckle</td>
<td>Brantford</td>
<td>Environmental Engineering Technician</td>
<td>City of Brantford Environmental Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harshad</td>
<td>Patel</td>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>Water Resources Engineer</td>
<td>City of Oshawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td>Water Resources Manager</td>
<td>City of Oshawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel</td>
<td>Finney</td>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>Watershed Restoration Planner</td>
<td>Conservation Halton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepideh</td>
<td>Majdi</td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>Development Engineer</td>
<td>City of Markham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soran</td>
<td>Sito</td>
<td>Markham</td>
<td>Manager, Environmental Assets</td>
<td>City of Markham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>Civil Technologist</td>
<td>Engage Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>Parson</td>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>EIT</td>
<td>Engage Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Salvino</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Development Engineering</td>
<td>City of Mississauga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Development Engineering</td>
<td>City of Mississauga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Rocco</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Development Engineering</td>
<td>City of Mississauga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Bowman</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Lawyer - Program Manager</td>
<td>Ecojustice Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Principal Planner</td>
<td>Pound &amp; Stewart Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta James</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Credit Reserve Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nando Iannicca</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>City of Mississauga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Bush</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
<td>Counterpoint Engineering Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Lau</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Stormwater Management Lead</td>
<td>Morrison Hershfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa Artman</td>
<td>Thornhill</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Fieldgate Developments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie Hutnick</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Green Infrastructure Design Technology</td>
<td>York Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Regehr</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Conservation Services Technician</td>
<td>Upper Thames River Conservation Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Vala</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Becker</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake Mete</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>City of Brampton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen Hui</td>
<td>Newmarket</td>
<td>Streetscaping Program Manager</td>
<td>York Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Waters</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Landscape Technologist</td>
<td>City of Brampton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James McCague</td>
<td>Newmarket</td>
<td>Landscape Technician</td>
<td>York Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Colangelo</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>City of Brampton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Batten</td>
<td>Douro Dummer</td>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>Basterfield &amp; Associates Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Letourneau</td>
<td>Rockwood</td>
<td>Aquatic Planning Ecologist</td>
<td>Conservation Halton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody Smith</td>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R.J. Burnside &amp; Associates Limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Jamieson</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>CITY OF MISSISSAUGA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gusche</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>CITY OF MISSISSAUGA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Bayne</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>CITY OF MISSISSAUGA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Katotikidis</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>CITY OF MISSISSAUGA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakia Sultana</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Hubb</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Policy Analyst</td>
<td>Ontario Growth Secrictariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristina Parker</td>
<td>Oakville</td>
<td>Water Resources Engineer</td>
<td>Town of Oakville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Juliao</td>
<td>Oakville</td>
<td>Water Resources Engineer</td>
<td>Town of Oakville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijay Gupta</td>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Schaeffer &amp; Associates Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Wigginsworth</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Marcy</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>Region of Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hurst</td>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>Senior Dev. Engineering Coordinator</td>
<td>Town of Caledon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javeed Khan</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Water Resources Engineer</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Akiib</td>
<td>Scarborough</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Atkinson</td>
<td>Etobicoke</td>
<td>Senior Dev. Engineering Coordinator</td>
<td>Town of Caledon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Pirzas</td>
<td>Orangeville</td>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>Town of Caledon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Strachan</td>
<td>Cookstown</td>
<td>Urban Designer/Senior Dev. Planner</td>
<td>Town of Caledon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janette Brenner</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Coordinator, Water Resources Engineer</td>
<td>Conservation Halton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory Harris</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Water Resources Engineer</td>
<td>Conservation Halton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Bang</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Junior Planner</td>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin Norman</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Manager, Waterfront Development Of City of Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Company/Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Pidsadny</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager, Waterfront D City of Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed English</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Senior Project Manager, Waterfront D City of Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfgang Wolter</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Ecosystem Recovery Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Prince</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Ecosystem Recovery Inc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Van Seters</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Toronto Region Conservation Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Young</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Toronto Region Conservation Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Denich</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Aquafor Beech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Cowlin</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Aquafor Beech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Herold</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Oaks Concrete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Van Haaster</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Oaks Concrete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael James</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>DeepRoot Canada Corp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devin Stuebing</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Permacon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Poirier</td>
<td>Mississauga ON</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Permacon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha Aguilera</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Xeroflor Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina Senjug</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>Xeroflor Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Hill</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renya Matties</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>student</td>
<td>McMaster University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mario Martinez</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>Engineering Technician</td>
<td>City of Guelph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness and Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrier</strong></td>
<td><strong>Solution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Buy-in from different municipal departments (i.e. operations department) | • Invite public works and operations staff to develop new building standards  
• Need champion in departments to facilitate communications |
| Support | • Political will/interdisciplinary team desire  
• $  
• Collaboration  
• Communication  
• Champions – both political and staff  
• Need emotional tie-in | • Develop cooperative working team comprised of municipal staff, agencies, political representations and consultant (technical)  
• Bring different elements to table to get through barriers including access to financial support, education, legislation. Work towards pilot/demonstration project (subdivision level more challenging) |
| Staff/Public awareness | Continue to monitor pilot and demonstration projects to get long-term data. Benefit from partnership with research institutions (living lab). Develop more pilots in communities to increase public awareness with universities. Showcase developers or companies that are doing a good job or leaning by example with LID |
| Education and Awareness – driving culture change | • Training and education of decision makers  
• Public outreach/engagement  
• Needing policy/targets to drive change  
• School curriculum  
• Public signage/engagement around pilot sites |
| Political and Public Support | • Improve messaging - consistency  
• Education – tours of pilot projects, commercials on TV, involve community etc.  
• Collaboration with community groups  
• Engaging politicians (tours, presentations) |
| Emotional (Fear) (Ib) | • Education  
• Promotion of demo projects that work well  
• Residents need to feel heard – get their feedback! People don’t like bump-outs/traffic calming  
• Provide rewards – i.e. credits, property value, neighbourhood green brand  
• Help residents deal with stormwater problems like Toronto backwater – get cities to act |
| Support from Residents, municipal staff, elected officials. Need to manage expectations | • Education so that the community demands the LID. Tours to educate residents and they pressure their councillors to implement in their neighbourhood.  
• Building the right residential units, the right landscape for the right location. Design is critical |
**TABLE DISCUSSION NOTES – ROADS AND RUNOFF**

| Acceptance | • Senior management  
| Council  
| General Public | • Education for all three groups  
| • Education done by outside/external organizations  
| • Engaging the public  
| • Engaging youth  
| • Partnerships – NGO’s/Private sector  
| • Market research segment |

| Lack of support from public works at municipal level – general lack of trust, lack of data, lack of knowledge, inflexible and unwilling to change (i.e standard road cross section) | • Direction from top of organization to put priority on LID  
| • Get council support  
| • More outreach and education to public and municipal leadership  
| • Better integration between departments (i.e. SWM, maintenance, operations.)  
| • Create a sustainability coordinator position that crosses departments that  
| • Considers bigger benefits (i.e. placemaking, health, well-being etc.,) and has this vision! |

| Development industry resistant to change | • BILD credits |

| Public Acceptance | • Market green streets |

| Liability/Risk | • More education  
| • Improve modelling of LID’s  
| • Clarity around insurance – it is perceived risk or real risk |

| Costs and Benefits |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| No incentives for developers to implement | • Explore risk tolerance tied to scale of development (i.e. 5ha vs 200ha site)  
| • Need to communicate successes and challenges  
| • Appetite for change to status quo  
| • Need strict criteria vs guidelines |

| Finances – capital and maintenance | • User fee  
| • Tax and incentives |

| • Equitable spending  
| • No money for inspecting built project  
| • Development charge by-law  
| • Low income areas  
| • Old infrastructure |

| Lack of LID lifecycle cost benefit analysis information (triple bottom line approach) | • Long-term monitoring of in the ground features. This should also entail a triple bottom line approach.  
| • Need to accept that this will be an ongoing process.  
<p>| • Can be done through public-private partnerships |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE DISCUSSION NOTES – ROADS AND RUNOFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial/cost implications</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need environmental economists to do a triple bottom line analysis and tie funding to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial – Capital costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DC’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reallocation of funds (existing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stormwater rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of incentive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Case studies that demonstrate a business case for investing in GSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide public incentives (reduce development change levy and similar programs, designed charrettes to ‘fast track’ permitting process, reducing permit fees for projects using LID’s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding from feds (i.e. gas tax)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incomplete picture of capital and operating costs and benefits to compare business as usual to green infrastructure.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement credit or compensation program, break on development charges etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide life-cycle costing comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Downsize end-of-pipe SWM system to get volume reduction credits for LID’s (MOECC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High life cycle costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Operation and Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design to meet existing maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with your capital works budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have SWM utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• R&amp;D better products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reuse materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Barrier</strong></th>
<th><strong>Solution</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy in SWM system is a liability (i.e. SWM pond is overdesigned and will not function as designed)</td>
<td>• Multi-faceted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Change in policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Give credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>• Relocation – too costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Construct around i.e. silva cell modular system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New developments – joint use trench. One corridor – ‘utilidoor’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing the right design based on site constraints (i.e. soils, utilities, snow removal, salting, load and haul excess, compaction, vehicles hitting trees). Why can’t tree’s grow?</td>
<td>• Staff training, expertise of consulting industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop detailed design standards and specification for road allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimum soil volumes an widths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Species selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Required topsoil depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Operations and maintenance manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of regulatory authority that need to be satisfied (i.e. new MNR policies)</td>
<td>Have a workshop with consultants and municipalities to discuss how policy has been implemented. There needs to be a feedback loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and standards</td>
<td>• Buy in from home builders association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mandate</td>
<td>• Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change of council</td>
<td>• Case studies – port land quantifiable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major system</td>
<td>• Realistic cost, environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Champions</td>
<td>• Carbon credits, stormwater rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No manuals</td>
<td>• Loose policy standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is LID</td>
<td>• No standards, make it a standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lawyers, risk – basements, creates problems, litigious</td>
<td>• Develop policy to mandate responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Buy in from home builders association</td>
<td>• Internal workshops/groups to develop solutions, share barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education</td>
<td>• Develop a process/direction framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility/lack of policy</td>
<td>Need clearer direction from top down to establish clearer and consistent guidance. May need to be a legislated requirement. Need incentives or requirements to do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of consistent guidelines or standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(standards applicable to varying communities, flexible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site conditions (existing infrastructure, soils, environmental)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to toolkits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy – lack of direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack performance results/reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge amongst consultants, contractors, resources, expertise, public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communications – internal between departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changing mindset – change is frustrating, guidelines are vague</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bylaws/policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• i.e mowing height, developer constraints and requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• pre-approval of LID products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy makers directly inform policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Researched systems – trusted info</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MOECC bulletin and guidelines to trump/guide local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cities get funding from province, feds for incentives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Living documents to promote flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alignment of policies within city and province</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE DISCUSSION NOTES – ROADS AND RUNOFF

| Coordination of Guidelines, regulations and standards | • Amendment process for LID measures  
• Standard BMP’s across guidelines  
• Cross-departmental input – building better communities  
• Knowledge sharing between municipalities, regions etc. (what was in that RFP’s?) |
|---|---|
| Policy | • All levels of government work together (MOE/regional governments)  
• Needs to be top down – makes it easier on municipalities  
• Need political will – ties into emotional  
• Standardization of policy  
• Make official plan – guidelines not enough for needs enforcement  
• Communication  
• Public education  
• Federal government gives credits for hopes with LID like the energy update program  
• Provide grants for LID projects |
| Lack of champion, authority, mandate | • MOECC update 2003 manual  
• Mandatory legislative vs voluntary  
• Criteria for permit  
• Watershed |
| Lack of legislation, with no provincial requirement for watershed planning then development is piece-meal. No regulatory requirement for LID. Missing competence at municipal level so LID is overlooked for fear of risk | • Make LID a critical component of ECA approval  
• Need MOE LID guidelines  
• Include in provincial plans, and therefore required in municipal plans  
• MOECC needs to ensure that ECA approval staff is very well training in LID.  
• In absence of legislation need more flexible, knowledgeable staff to approve LID projects. Support staff with time for education of existing or hire new staff that is qualified.  
• MOECC needs to ensure that ECA approval staff is very well training in LID. |
| Approval process  
• Custom LID vs Conventional LID | • design standards need to change  
• defined specifications and main lot level controls |

### Operations and Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Maintenance and monitoring (steep learning curve) | • Training/education  
• Creation of performance standards |
| Impacts of salt and de-icing | • Permeable paving  
• Cattails, reg along strips  
• Research dissemination for the general public  
• is salt even a problem? |
## TABLE DISCUSSION NOTES – ROADS AND RUNOFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Who is responsible for O&amp;M of ROW projects – who maintains and ensures performance over time?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Money – specialized staff, economies of scale when you build, more qualified contractors</td>
<td>- Need revenue stream (reallocating/priority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improve design aspects</td>
<td>- Earmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Get residents involved (i.e. competitions)</td>
<td>- Developer fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Make sure residents involved are going to buy in – education</td>
<td>- Capitalize maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educate on O&amp;M before hand - make sure they know the what and why</td>
<td>- Lifecycle – design for low maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Skill sharing/community volunteers</td>
<td>- Cost/benefit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lack of performance target on a watershed | - Target no problem for new build  
- Set achievable target on a watershed basis  
- Need municipalities to be the lead on implementation |
| Inability to give credit to LID BMP's due to lack of quantitative tools beyond infiltration rates (how recognize evapotranspiration plant uptake etc.) only relying on storage and infiltration. | - Recognition of importance of monitoring data  
- MOECC guideline should incorporate this data  
- MOECC should conduct testing/monitoring for LID as they did for storm ponds |
| Impact on the assumption process | - Monitoring period vs assumption period – assumption needs to take place after monitoring has shown the practice is working. |

### Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Communication within an organization/group for the implementation of LID, even if interest is there | - Central database to identify projects (road, urban, forestry etc. and prioritize needs)  
- Internal workshops/groups to develop solutions, share barriers |
### Marketing and Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for user-friendly, evidence based information for outreach and engagement (to make the case for LID)</td>
<td>This is where partners from universities can help. A partner or group (province) should take the lead in collating and distilling technical info on an ongoing basis and should be put in to a usable format</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tools, Training, and Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for a context-sensitive decision making screening tool for selecting appropriate LID options/locations on a site specific basis</td>
<td>This speaks to user friendly computer tools that can help short-list potential LID options. This needs to be developed and used by interdisciplinary teams so that the tool is as effective as possible. This will help screen LID options using the triple bottom line approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Resources
- Human: experts and knowledge
- Can limit policy creation

- Database
- Share resources
- Gain council support
- Get community involved, stewardship programs
- “Package” with solution for residents

#### Lack of knowledge
- Design
- Construction
- O&M
- Replacement
- Public Engagement

- Engage youth
- Training
- Partnerships
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Roads and Runoff: Implementing Green Streets in the Greater Golden Horseshoe
March 1, 2016
Port Credit, Ontario

Workshop Feedback

Total number of attendees: 120

1. Level of Satisfaction with the event

Rate your satisfaction with the keynote speaker

- Highly Satisfied: 48%
- Satisfied: 45%
- Neutral: 7%
- Unsatisfied: 1%
- Very Unsatisfied: 1%

Rate your satisfaction with the presentations

- Highly Satisfied: 39%
- Satisfied: 60%
- Neutral: 1%
- Unsatisfied: 0%
- Very Unsatisfied: 0%
Rate your satisfaction with the break-out session:

- Highly Satisfied: 55%
- Satisfied: 42%
- Neutral: 3%
- Unsatisfied: 2%
- Very Unsatisfied: 1%

Rate your satisfaction with the venue:

- Highly Satisfied: 58%
- Satisfied: 26%
- Neutral: 14%
- Unsatisfied: 2%
- Very Unsatisfied: 2%

Rate your overall satisfaction with the event:

- Highly Satisfied: 56%
- Satisfied: 42%
- Neutral: 2%
- Unsatisfied: 2%
- Very Unsatisfied: 2%
2. **What was the most beneficial part of the workshop?**

- Good mix of theory and applied examples. Solid mix of disciplines, range of presenter backgrounds
- LID system
- variety of speakers, projects and disciplines presented and applied
- The discussion session was excellent. Presentations were perfect length with green perspectives covered
- Breakout groups and networking opportunities
- Specific examples of lessons learned and processes that worked
- hearing about LID implementation from various perspectives
- diversity of opinion
- I really found value in and enjoyed the networking lunch and the breakout session. However the morning presentations gave us the material to discuss and make reference to
- Diversity of the group - lots of different perspectives
- group discussion
- Seeing what other municipalities are doing and the problems they have
- Exposure to various people involved at all levels of LID implementation (elected officials, engineers, conservation authorities)
- The initial keynote was very valuable, his knowledge was enlightening and I look forward to learning more from his work
- To hear about success stories of LID being implemented. Ability to brainstorm and provide input during breakout session
- breakout discussion
- caliber of expertise of presenters, variety of organizations presenting slightly different approaches/ levels of commitment
- Break-out sessions provided great discussion
- I enjoyed hearing specific examples and seeing photos
- Opportunities to talk to people from multiple disciplines and backgrounds
- keynote presentation, case study (Halton Hills subdivision), discussion at table
- Discussions (based on presenters) and displays - very informative
- Glen Williams example and presentation. CA's and engineering working together is very important
- Showing examples and current projects
- exchange of information, experiences, pilots
- It was less technical and more based on how to start implementing these projects
- Meeting with others in the industry to share ideas etc.
- excellent presentations about leaving the point of view of municipal staff
- Listening to Robert Goo - well worth! Networking
- Presentations and break-out sessions with different people at the table
- examples from other jurisdictions
- breakout session
- learning best practices, other jurisdictions like us, being able to talk beyond roads and runoff
- learning experiences and best practices from peer municipalities
• break-out sessions, sharing ideas and coming up with solutions
• Question session, presentation was beneficial, basically expanding the dialogue
• Connecting with industry people to share knowledge/experience/info
• interactive problem solving
• case studies that overcome the challenges of technical funding and political issues
• Contributions from Mississauga, Halton hills and Peel regions on their experiences implementing LID
• application of LID and GI in the ROW
• The presentations and the breakout sessions were really helpful for me. Also the keynote was inspiring
• Discussions and networking - having the opportunity to talk though barriers and generate solutions across disciplines
• educating myself on LID
• break-out session
• discussion between different agency staff about several LID applications and policies adopted by different agencies
• Case studies of green infrastructure implemented in cities. Networking with others in a similar field
• Meeting different practitioners of LID and hearing their views
• ten step process of regional road design, incorporating LID
• Being able to hear about LID lessons learned and expectations
• networking and mount of info available
• the presentations were very informative and relevant
• LID ideas and experience on already built projects
• 3 presentations to learn. Break out session to meet everyone and learn their challenges too
• specific examples on how it works from a planning, funding and maintenance perspective
• break-out sessions
• good discussion, very practical
• broad spectrum of opinion
• getting perspectives from experts and the champions
4. **What Topics would you like to see covered in the future?**

- processes involved in getting approvals - who does what, how system works to get things eventually in the ground
- Examples or projects in GTA with LID techniques
- More info on the long-term benefits/analysis/costs of LID implementation
- Implementation of green infrastructure in subdivision development including public green space
- Discussing SWM fee/rate structures. How to engage communities in the adoption of lot level LID's
- Actual performance of products and systems. Let’s hear the research on each feature
- Criteria, evaluation process
- financial support discussion
- design, construction, methodology, how to's what worked in their design and what didn't
- How to measure performance (quality and quantity) to gain trust in LID products and design. And also facilitate approvals of SWM design
- I would like to see more technical aspects of LID. Really a field walk exploring features, their construction and maintenance would be great
- Operational and maintenance challenges and solutions. Lifecycle costs/case studies re: cost/benefit analysis
- Public involvement in the LID implementation. Political good will to implement LID's
• Presenting results of specific projects which have succeeded/failed. Examples of overcoming specific common challenges
• international perspective perhaps
• concentrate on data and research
• monitoring of pilot projects and data to inform future projects
• Discussion of funding, maintenance of green streets. Placing a uniform policy throughout Ontario (or for south Ontario)
• LID implementation on private land
• more details on monitoring and maintenance and how to budget for that
• show more issues encountered in pilot projects and how they have or can be rectified/improved
• Life cycle cost - are these sustainable?
• Maintenance of LID implemented measures
• Specific info on timing (logistics) of installing LID within new developments - is LID installed at the beginning (part of servicing) or are they installed once more lots have been stabilized? How are maintenance periods if installed towards end of project (assumptive)?
• cost, maintenance of LID
• Current legislation - provincial - what needs to change
• Cost benefit analysis of LIDs including how to encourage better integration of all the benefits of LID (e.g. health, traffic calming, SWM etc.), long term considerations. Converting monitoring into new analysis/calculation tools
• operations and maintenance implications and costs
• financial impact of green infrastructure
• creating a permanent community of practice for knowledge sharing, relationship building, and telling success stories
• The tie in between green streets and how it will affect urban forestry. Change in planting?
• detailed permeable pavement/paving time
• Maintenance cost model. Challenges - soil, tree survivability, tree specs
• more tree replacing issues/opportunities
• Hard data on the impact of salt in solution on trees and vegetation’s. That proves salt is not a huge issues. Greater it in to place making
• More local experiences. Panel discussion between elected municipal and provincial stakeholders and reps from insurance industry, real-estate
• operation, maintenance and monitoring of LID and GI
• I’m very new to this so for me it was all great. I would like to hear more about the implementation process of some projects. Also a project that makes a community level partnership would be interesting to hear about
• community-level solutions - it would be great to head from GCC and its local offices how programs like Depave and Rain can help generate public support and political buy-in for GI
• Why we should care about environmental conservation, research perspective - biology, enviro sci. Plant ecology/sustainability/hydrology, changing public perceptions
• instillation of residential LID, community buy-in
• specific LID design - any
• salt and contamination, operations and maintenance
• Display of concrete results of the policy and function of the LID infrastructure. How much stuff is getting removed (contaminants)?
• more exact examples of LID on roads
• policy implementation
• Policy and gaps with provincial direction. Conflicting standards
• Gathering players to streamline maintenance consistency between jurisdiction. Funding models aka SWM tax, oversite, DC etc.
• dealing with 100 year storms
• more about legislative advances at the municipal level
• tangible benefits for implementation as an alternative to contemporary infrastructure costs assessment
• quantitative benefits of implementing LID, case studies on comparing conventional stormwater management with LID/Green infrastructure

5. Other Comments
• Awesome food! Well organized, green venue and location
• very good seminar. Well organized and represented
• well done
• I would love an additional workshop focusing on residential lot level LID’s. I think the key to changing the SWM status quo is citizens demanding to see this change in their communities/municipalities
• wonderful, thank you
• Need more practical application. Venue was cold
• the presentation and workshop are too short (may be two days)
• More politicians should come as well as other policy makers
• Lovely touch having sustainable catering
• It would be great to see a walk-through of a policy creation - highlighting what the average person may miss. Otherwise a great learning experience
• Food was excellent. Lack of parking close by was a negative. Good cross-section of attendees (municipal staff, CA staff, consultants, planners, engineers, landscape architects)
• Follow-up report (information) should be distributed to the participants via email
• 1. Great presentations, great lunch.
• 2. Facilitator for group discussion kept things on track.
• 3. Thank you for considering the weather and shortening the day accordingly
• excellent workshop
• thought it was well ran - good variety and interesting group of speakers
• Thank you. Provide materials online if possible - prior or after the event
• Gave a good indication on where LID implementation stands - pilot projects and increasing awareness. A long way to go before LID is business as usual. Thank you
• Good variety of speakers. Excellent lunch
• Lunch was well done. Vital, interesting, engaged crowd - great, discussions, energy
• I would love to see how the LID implemented projects are functioning after 5 years of service to see if they are effective long-term
• Great venue and plenty of info
• Very good. May want to do a workshop focused at operational staff
• Well run. Could have used more time for discussion groups. Please run more sessions in the future.
• Some presentations rushed. Maybe could have less time for breaks
• Great workshop, thanks
• Well done!
• Presenters very knowledgeable and interesting motivators. Kept my attention. Thanks
• Fantastic networking - big thanks. Want a fall session
• Great caterer
• Great food. Great topic that needs more support and understanding
• The breakout session was really helpful to hear the real stories and challenges that a diversity of folks experience (not in a nice packed up way). We could have used more time for the breakout session. Also having the panel presentation as an actual panel would’ve broken up the routine presentation format. Overall a great event, thank you
• The presentations would have benefits from a more panel discussion approach with the opportunity to hear the speakers engage with one another and the audience more. Q&A was great!
• Great event to bring together like-minded individuals and share ideas. Gaining inspiration for green infrastructure. Could bring in a few more diverse areas: research, landscaper, scientist, urban design, artist, creative ways to engage the public on environmental issues and green infrastructure. Very valuable experience and I think there should be more events like this. Thank you!
• Public education and community engagement are the backbone of LID.
• Well done and managed considering timelines and agenda
• Great workshop. Great pace, very relevant presentations with local presenters. Price was very reasonable and the food was excellent
• Good value overall
• We seem to be arriving at the same barriers and ask of our councillors, staff, the public etc. I challenge the CVC and Green Communities to put resources and time into workshops where people don't repeat the same challenges - we know this already. Focus on evidenced, informed decision making and how it could lead to better and more intentional planning, policies and programs. Also, let’s begin to fund research and implementation relationships between universities and colleges, and municipalities. Take advantage of institution living labs (i.e U of T transportation Tomorrow Survey, U of Guelph agriculture and sustainability, McMaster U flooding and LID infrastructure resiliency, Queen’s U Municipal infrastructure and SWM, Fleming College GIS, urban forestry and landscaping)
• great with organizing, communicating and keeping on task
• Keep up the good work
• excellent