

**Joint Stewardship Board  
Technical Meeting: 1) Nest options 2) Hydro One**

**Meeting Notes**

City Hall, 71 Main Street West  
February 29, 2016 (3:00 – 4:30 pm)

**City of Hamilton Members:**

Councillor Chad Collins  
Councillor Doug Conley  
Councillor Maria Pearson

**Haudenosaunee Members:**

Aaron Detlor  
Brian Doolittle

**Board Resources**

Jennifer DiDomenico, City of Hamilton  
Adrienne Kupchanko, City of Hamilton:  
Rob Norman, City of Hamilton  
Guy Paparella, City of Hamilton

**Coordinator:** Sheri Longboat

**Chair:** Maria Pearson

**Meeting Notes:** Sheri Longboat

**DTAH**

Bryce Miranda  
Robert Cram

**Hydro One**

Daniel Charbonneau  
Ani Bekmezian  
Jake Z.  
Neil Anderson  
Sara Jane Souliere

Item	Topic	
1	<p><b>DTAH Presentation: Nest Meeting Place, Preliminary Design Options</b></p> <p>DTAH distributed a brief report entitled <i>“Preliminary Design Submission, February 2016”</i> that outlined four concept designs for JSB consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) inverted nest,</li> <li>2) concrete nest,</li> <li>3) metal nest, and</li> <li>4) functional habitat.</li> </ol> <p>There was general consensus among the City board members that design 4 was the preferred option. Discussion focused on materials and durability, site purpose and function, seating area and potential for amphitheater, cost, and need to ensure a CPTED review is completed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use “Meeting Place” terminology,</li> <li>• Operational staff would need to review selected design,</li> </ul> <p>The Haudenosaunee representatives stressed the need for human interaction with the nest and felt the existing design is very modernistic and not in the language of the Haudenosaunee. Is there a way to have something ground level and more interactive?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too contemporary</li> <li>• Need some ability to interact with the meeting place</li> <li>• Should feel like you are in a nest</li> </ul>	3:05 pm

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bring trees in to soften things up</li> <li>• Blend in natural landscape into area</li> <li>• Consider flow of the creek</li> <li>• Need more work on the design</li> </ul> <p><b>Decision: More work on the design to incorporate comments. DTAH to come back with 2 concepts that would provide a non-detailed design to present to the JSB.</b></p>	
	Hydro One Guests Arrive	
<b>2</b>	<b>Hydro One Proposed Activities in Red Hill Valley</b>	<b>3:40 pm</b>
	<p>2.1 Presentation on JSB by Haudenosaunee reps</p> <p>A. Detlor stated that Hydro One had not consulted or engaged the Haudenosaunee citing recognized treaty rights; there is a reconciliation process between the City and Haudenosaunee, and the Red Hill Valley agreements, which are sacred and solemn agreements – there are sacred tree and rights protected by treaty, and Hydro One activities will impair and infringe on Haudenosaunee rights and interests. He expressed that justification is required on activities that impact aboriginal and treaty rights. It was asked if Hydro One intends on moving ahead without engaging the Haudenosaunee, and if Hydro One has address Nanfan Treaty rights in any way?</p>	
	<p>2.2 Presentation on Vegetation Management Plan by Hydro One</p> <p>Hydro One representatives, A. Bekmezian and D. Charbonneau, expressed they would take away the concerns expressed by the Haudenosaunee, seek direction from Ministry of Energy, and that the maintenance activities have not triggered the duty to consult – vegetation maintenance does not trigger EA. Hydro One “will take it into consideration” and will follow up with inside council re: legal assertions. Hydro One will provide contact information to Carol-Ann Brewer who will determine direction and next step.</p> <p>J. Z. and N. Anderson who represent Hydro One forestry provided a presentation entitled “<i>Transmission Corridor along Red Hill Valley Parkway, Vegetation Management, n.d.</i>”</p> <p>They explained that maintenance practices changed in 2003 and to address safety and reliability aspects, any non-compatible vegetation in the 1.6 km long, 110-foot easement, would be removed as per NERC audit requirement. It would include chemical spraying.</p> <p>Questions were raised about standards, the decision-making framework, and the feasibility of adopting a higher maintenance level (more frequent) rather than complete removal, as an example of alternatives to the</p>	

	proposed approach.	
	<b>Meeting Adjourned</b>	<b>4:35</b>