

# APPENDIX A

## Executive Summary

*The Rouge Park is as remarkable environmental asset. Yet, it is even more remarkable for what it could be: a gateway to wilderness park experiences within an hour's drive of almost 7 million Canadians – and accessible by public transit.*

*To realize this vision, change is required. The Rouge Park needs new funding commitments and a new structure to give it a proper leadership and accountability structure.*

*In our view, the best means of resolving the need for land, funding and better governance would be to designate the Rouge Park as Canada's first "near urban" National Park.*

### 1. Background

In August 2009, the Rouge Park Alliance retained StrategyCorp Inc. in collaboration with Hemson Consulting Ltd. to undertake this review of the Rouge Valley Park. The purpose was to make recommendations on options for its future leadership, financing and organization, with a view to fulfilling the Vision of the Park. This study is the product of five months of focused effort involving the Rouge Park Alliance and its team of professionals. This study considers how a redesign of park governance and funding arrangements could help make Park Vision come to reality.

The consulting team approached this study with a keen awareness that the Park is not in need of an academic study about what "might be". It is much more important to provide a model that could be implemented.

The participants recognized this when they rated "ability to create (or get agreement on) a new "Founding Deal" among Alliance members" as the most important attribute of a reform package.

Thus, in addition to the objective realities of the Park, we also sought to understand as fully as possible the subjective political dimensions of the Park, with a view to defining the key political enablers and the barriers to success.

The Rouge Park was borne out of activism and a political response to a compelling concept and opportunity. Since its creation, the efforts of the Alliance have further defined and consolidated the opportunity.

Even today, however, the basic discussion about what the Rouge Park could or should be remains unresolved. There is still no universal shared definition of the "Rouge Park" – even among Alliance Members.

Perhaps because of this, the Rouge Park is still without many of the fundamental features or benchmarks of a successful park. It does not have:

- a consolidated, well defined land base
- a comprehensive master plan
- a funded implementation strategy
- a functional governance model

- an articulated park brand (what it is, what it does, and who it is attracting).

A map of the lands covered in this study is attached as Figure ES.1. Collectively, these lands are described as the “Rouge Park Governance Report Study Area”. A detailed description of the Study Area is provided in Chapter 2 of this report.

## **2. Funding**

The Study Process assessed the current level of operating and capital funding, with a view to determining the adequacy of current funding levels.

In terms of the operating budget, it is clear that the existing level of funding is inadequate.

Using conservative approximations of costs per hectare, it is estimated that an annual operating budget of approximately \$4 million is required to ensure the sustainability of Blocks 1 and 2 of the Park. The annual cost would be higher were a portion of Little Rouge East area to be allocated to non-agricultural uses.

In regard to the capital budget, depending on the specifics of the Master Plan, it is reasonable to project that bringing the facilities in the Park up to a level that is more in keeping with the scale and significance of the Park could easily require a capital investment of more than \$40 million over a period of 10 years.

No detailed plans have been prepared for the lands in Block 3. Accordingly, it is very difficult to project either a capital or operating budget for the area. Were it to remain in agricultural uses, additional capital requirements would likely be modest and operating costs minimal. If, however, parts of the area were to be reforested and/or converted to more substantial park-type uses, capital cost at a minimum of \$10,000 and likely \$13,000 per hectare would be required. Annual net operating costs would also increase at between \$300 and \$650 per hectare approximately.

The Report recommends that the Rouge Park Alliance seek a commitment to adequate, secure funding to allow it better meet its needs.

## **3. Limitations of the Existing Governance Model**

The Rouge Park Alliance was originally created to provide temporary leadership during the creation of the new park. In its structure, it delivered broad stakeholder representation to the Park while it was in its infancy, and, under its leadership, many important milestones have been reached. Nevertheless, the Report concludes that the existing structure of the Alliance faces several key limitations:

- It is an unincorporated “Alliance” and does not have legal “natural person powers”. Accordingly, it is unable to own land or contract in its own name. This is a severe limitation to its ability to directly manage and be accountable for the Park

- Secondly, with the exception of the Chair, appointees to the Rouge Park Alliance sit in a representational capacity, whereby they represent the organization that appointed them. The Alliance is an Advisory Body, and not a true decision-making board of directors for the Rouge Valley Park.

The Report recommends that the Rouge Park Alliance seek a new governance model, to improve its ability to manage and be accountable for the Park.

This is true, whether or not the Park achieves a new funding arrangement.

It is axiomatic that in the design of governance, “form follows function.” Accordingly, the specifics of the new arrangements should wait for a resolution of the funding question. There are many different ways of achieving this basic structure, and it can be customized to meet the mix of funders, donors of land, and their mix of accountability expectations and requirements.

Both of these goals require a new “Founding Deal,” whereby:

- one or more government entity undertakes to be the funder, and
- the accountability needs of the funder are built into the new governance model.

#### **4. Towards a New Founding Deal**

The enthusiasm of the champions of the Park has created significant political momentum for a new Founding Deal and an enhanced Rouge Valley Park.

The Founding Deal must set out in clear terms how the Park can co-exist and be managed within the adjacent urban landscape. Further, it must also provide a framework by which to manage the diversity of uses within the Park area.

Thus, the Founding Deal must address both:

- The core deliverables needed to improve the park.
- The needs of the partners, ranging from corporate goals to political imperatives.

To address the strengths and weaknesses identified through the process, the Founding Deal would have to address the following:

1. Vision: what is the role of the Park?
2. Land: what will the boundaries be?
3. Funding: what entities will fund and to what level?
4. Governance and transitional arrangements.

There are three main barriers to achieving a new Founding Deal:

1. Finding a funder(s)
2. Resolving ambiguities
3. Resolving issues
4. Resolving Boundaries.

Firstly, there was widespread recognition and agreement among Study participants that the biggest challenge will be to secure a willing funder (or funders) in the current economic climate.

Secondly, in discussions with study participants, it became apparent that there are many details about these four components that are insufficiently defined, and that need to be fleshed out in order to reach a new Founding Deal. It should not be assumed that these details constitute areas of disagreement, so much as areas where further elaboration is required.

Thirdly, there are three major unresolved issues which, if left unresolved, could be a barrier to concluding a new Founding Deal. They all relate to the diversity of the land, and the need of the park to accommodate diverse interests within or near its boundaries.

1. Municipalities are concerned that the Rouge Park could have a negative impact on:
  - The ability to plan regional infrastructure corridors passing through the Rouge Park lands
  - Municipal ability to plan and deliver on the requirements of such provincial legislation as the *Places to Grow Act*
2. Many stakeholders could not support the Park if it were not implemented in a way that was compatible with sustainable agricultural practices
3. Members of the Alliance do not have a common understanding of what the boundaries of the Rouge Park can or should be.

In regard to boundaries, an expanded Rouge Park could provide a connecting link between Lake Ontario and the Oak Ridges Moraine. The consulting team believes that this is a very compelling vision. To achieve it, it would be necessary to include the area described as Blocks 1, 2 and 3 in the Rouge Park. As noted above, there is as of yet no well defined plan for how the lands in Block 3 could be integrated into the Park. In light of the significant work that remains to be done with respect to planning for Block 3, in our view, the most pragmatic course at present would be a phased approach:

- The Founding Deal for a new Rouge Park should address the existing Park Boundaries (described herein as Blocks 1 and 2), exclusive of City of Toronto lands in operation as the Toronto Zoo and closed Beare Sanitary Landfill site
- A determination to include some or all on the Federal lands in Block 3 should be the subject of discussions during the Founding Deal process, including consideration of the lands to be set aside for park purposes in Markham and final decisions regarding the preservation of agricultural land.

All participants in the study process were in favour of achieving an enhanced park of some description. In the opinion of the consulting team, there is a general agreement that the Park must coexist and be viable with its diverse neighbours. While there remains considerable work to be done to reach a full agreement, the consulting team believes that the areas of difference should not be overestimated. We believe that through the proper process of fleshing out implementation details, there could be an agreement reached on these issues.

## **5. Considering Park Models**

The Report evaluates eight park models against the following three criteria:

- **Funding:** Ability to secure sufficient fiscal resources
- **Control of Land:** Ability to concentrate land ownership
- **Authority and expertise:** Gives operating agency sufficient authority and expertise over the Park.

The Report concludes that no model is perfect, and no matter what model is chosen, some legislative “hybridization” is likely to be required. This terminology has been used to describe the modifications to an existing governance model that might be required to allow it to meet the unique governance needs of the Rouge Park. In some cases, such hybridizations could require legislative change. In other case, they might only require regulatory change. In either case, it is the assumption of this study that to be a plausible hybrid, the changes would be limited in nature, and preserve the overall integrity of the model and legislative framework.

The National Park and Provincial Park models appear to best meet the three criteria of ability to deliver funding, control of the land and authority and expertise. Indeed, both would be very strong models which could meet all the requirements at a high level.

The consultant team then applied a final criterion relating to the likelihood of the model to deliver a Founding Deal. This is not a function of the Formal Evaluation process, but rather a subjective judgment having regard to the ability to achieve a Founding Deal. In the view of the consultant team, the National Park model is the most promising model insofar as we are aware that Parks Canada is interested in opportunities to better connect its mandate and programs to the Greater Toronto Area. In this context, a near urban park would be a good opportunity to reach this audience with close-to-market nature and park experiences.

It is important to stress that each of the other models *could* be made to work for the Rouge Park. Properly executed, each would still deliver better governance characteristics than the Rouge Park Alliance currently has with its limited model. To be made to work, however, they would appear to require the expenditure of significant political will and effort to work around financial and technical challenges.

Given the analysis, we recommend the creation of a Rouge National Park.

Such a park would be the first near-urban national park of its kind, and would reflect the Vision and unique opportunity offered by these significant lands.

## **6. Recommendations**

Based upon the review and analysis conducted through this study, it is recommended that the Rouge Park Alliance adopt the following:

1. **Secure the agreement of the existing Alliance Members**
  - support for a National Park

- agree to the terms of a Founding Deal as set out below in table ES 2.
2. Call upon the Governments of Canada and Ontario to:
    - commence negotiations on a memorandum of Understanding to establish the Rouge National Park which would address the requirements of a Founding Deal, as set out below in table ES 2
    - address the opportunity to create a shared interpretive centre to anchor the Rouge Park and act as a gateway to the larger provincial and national park experience.
  3. The Rouge Park Alliance prepare a public and stakeholder communications and branding strategy, to capitalize on the current political interest in the environment and the window of opportunity afforded by the international focus on the GTA that will arise from the Pan-Am Games and G20 meetings.
  4. In the event that there is no progress on a new Founding Deal by December 30, 2010, it is recommended that the Rouge Park Alliance seek an initiative from the Government of Ontario that it be reconstituted as a not-for-profit arms-length agency with updated board and governance structures, and natural person powers, in order to address the governance weaknesses inherent in the existing alliance model.

## **APPENDIX B**

**To:** Chair and Members of the Policy and Administration Committee  
Meeting #1/09, September 15, 2009

**From:** Alan Wells, Chair, Rouge Park Alliance and Management Staff

**Re:** **Rouge Park Staff Response to  
The Recommendations of  
Markham's Rouge Park Implementation Task Force Report**

---

### **KEY ISSUE**

Present Rouge Park staff response to the recommendations of Markham's Rouge Park Implementation Task Force report.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT the Policy and Administration Committee endorse the following report and forward it to the Rouge Park Alliance for approval;**

**AND FURTHER THAT the Chair of the Rouge Park Alliance present this position to Markham Council.**

### **BACKGROUND**

#### **Introduction:**

At the February 6, 2009 meeting of the Rouge Park Alliance, Markham Deputy Mayor Jack Heath made a presentation on the report "Rouge Park: A Park in Progress". The Alliance received the report and passed the following motion:

**THAT the Rouge Park Alliance request staff to report back on how the report: "Rouge Park: A Park in Progress" upholds the spirit and intent of the Rouge Park Management Plan.**

Rouge Park staff have reviewed the recommendations contained within Markham's Rouge Park Implementation Task Force (RPITF) Report and propose that the following responses be forwarded to the Rouge Park Alliance and subsequently to the Chair of the RPITF.

SECRET

**Rouge Park Staff Response to Markham's RPITF Recommendation #:**

*1.a.1: That the Town establish a municipal park in east Markham called "Rouge Park"*

**The Rouge Park Alliance welcomes Markham's recognition of Rouge Park on its maps, as Toronto, TRCA, Ontario and others do for that portion of the Park in Toronto.**

**Rouge Park is in fact an inter-regional park located in Toronto, York and Durham Regions. It is an ecological nature park, a zoo, a campground, a waterfront park, a trail system, a collection of natural and cultural features and sites, and an agricultural community. Its diverse features include functions that are included in a municipal park, a regional forest, a conservation area, and a provincial or national park. Rouge Park is managed by a Board representing the federal, provincial, and municipal governments, and a number of other partners. Overall, Rouge Park is unique and warrants provincial and national significance.**

**This issue should be referred to the Rouge Park Organization and Finance Review Steering Committee.**

*1.a.2: That the Little Rouge Creek Corridor, Bob Hunter Memorial Park, Eastern Markham and Tompion lands be included in Rouge Park, and that Toogood Pond Park, Milne Dam Conservation Area and the Middle Reaches north of Major Mackenzie not be included in Rouge Park.*

**To be referred to the Rouge Park Organization and Finance Review Steering Committee.**

*1.a.3: That the lands and properties owned by the Town of Markham known as "Cedarena", "Cedar Grove Community Park", and "Cedar Grove Community Centre" continue to be owned and managed by Markham.*

**Agreed, provided that the management is in the context of an overall Rouge Park Plan**

*1.a.4: That staff enter into negotiations with the MTO, ORC and TRCA to complete the transfer of remnant parcels of land in east Markham to the Town or to the future Rouge Park.*

**Agree with this recommendation provided that the Chair of Rouge Park Alliance is included in the negotiations.**



*1.b.1: That the Federal Airport lands in Markham be integrated into Rouge Park and that staff enter into discussions with the Federal Government on the matter as soon as possible.*

**Rouge Park agrees with this recommendation. The Federal Airport lands include the upper reaches of the Rouge Watershed and serve as a critical ecological link to the Oak Ridges Moraine.**

*1.b.2: That the Town coordinate efforts with the Federal Government, the TRCA, and Rouge Park Alliance to implement the Green Space vision in a manner consistent with its vision and the objectives of the TRCA, Rouge Park and the Town.*

**Agree that a coordinated approach is essential to realizing the Green Space vision.**

*1.c: That the Town engage the Rouge Park Alliance, TRCA, the Region, Province and the Federal Government to establish appropriate names for distinct areas and features within Greater Rouge Park.*

**Agree with this recommendation.**

*2.a.1: That ecologically focussed camping be permitted within Rouge Park and that a small number of sites be located after criteria are established by staff and the Alliance, and that one of the sites be large enough to handle group camping.*

**Agree that a small number of wilderness camping sites would be appropriate within the Park. Further discussion will be needed in order to plan for site locations, facilities and services.**

*2.a.2: That Council provide further direction on RV camping services within Rouge Park.*

**Do not agree with creating more RV camping sites within the Park. RV camping requires far too much infrastructure and land area. It does not encourage nature appreciation and exploration in the same manner as simple tent camping would. RV camping is inconsistent with the goals and intent of Rouge Park.**

*2.b: That staff be directed to consult with the Rouge Park to identify potential dog off-leash areas and that such sites be developed after criteria are established by staff and the Alliance.*

**The Alliance has directed Rouge Park staff to work with partners to identify potential dog off-leash areas. Staff is proceeding with this exercise.**

*2.c.1: That staff work with Rouge Park to identify potential locations for a large group picnic area and that implementation be considered a priority.*

**Agree that a large group picnic area can be accommodated in the Park and we will work with partners, including Markham, to identify a suitable site. We have asked Markham to suggest some possible locations.**

*2.c.2: That Rouge Park include numerous smaller picnic sites throughout the Park and consideration be given to a celebration forest and an arboretum/horticultural garden area.*

**Agree that a number of small picnic sites would be appropriate near trailheads/parking areas. There is already a Celebration Forest in Rouge Park. We disagree with the establishment of an arboretum/horticultural garden, as this would be inconsistent with the ecological focus of the Park.**

*2.d.1: That staff and the Alliance treat with the highest priority the preparation of a detailed Rouge Park trails and pathways plan, especially in Eastern Markham and the Little Rouge Corridor.*

**We do consider this a high priority. Funds are included in the 2009 budget to start this process. We look forward to working with Markham/York Pickering/Durham, Toronto and TRCA to develop a trail master plan for the entire park.**

*2.e.1: That staff and the Alliance identify a location for an outdoor activity centre in Eastern Markham.*

*2.e.2: That staff and the Alliance identify a location for an outdoor cultural centre in Eastern Markham, for plays, music, nature lectures and volunteer planting activity coordination.*

**The management planning process for the East Markham lands is currently underway and a steering committee has been formed (on which Markham is well represented). The potential for an outdoor activity/cultural centre**

**will form part of this management planning discussion. It will include a picnic area.**

*2.f.1: That the Alliance be advised that the Town supports the relocation of Rouge Park offices to the Park in Markham and encourages Rouge Park to commence review of their office/interpretive centre requirements with a vision of locating in or near the Park.*

*2.f.2: That the Town make every effort to assist Rouge Park in finding a suitable location at a reasonable cost.*

**We welcome this recommendation. The office should be relocated to the Park and visitor centre(s) need to be established there. Markham's assistance in finding suitable locations for these facilities would be valuable.**

*2.f.3: That the relationship between the Markham Museum and Rouge Park be formalized and that staff explore all opportunities to develop a shared experience for the visiting public.*

**Agree with this recommendation. Rouge Park staff are currently working on partnership initiatives with the Markham Museum.**

*2.g / 2.g.1: Other recommended activities*

**Generally, Rouge Park staff recommend that only low-impact nature appreciation activities (i.e. hiking, snowshoeing, etc.) be permitted on Park trails, while the remainder of activities listed under "category 1" can be concentrated in a small number of areas designated for more intensive public use including the outdoor activity centre. Exactly which activities are to be accommodated, and where they are to be located, needs to be the subject of further discussion.**

*2.g.2: That staff and the Alliance increase their efforts to enforce the ban on hunting in Rouge Park.*

**Agree that this must be a priority and enforcement effects must include all enforcement agencies.**

*3.a: That the Town and the Alliance support the planning of necessary infrastructure improvements, such as road widenings, sewer projects, transit enhancements, etc., in a manner that provides opportunities for enhanced environmental benefits in support of the goals and objectives of Rouge Park.*

**Agree with this recommendation.**

*3.b.1: That the Town support watercourse crossing signage to identify watersheds for crossings of watercourses with official names except that, inside Rouge Park, the signs would identify the Park rather than the watershed.*

**Agree.**

*3.b.2: That the Town endorse in principle the proposal of the Don Watershed Regeneration Council for watercourse crossing signage.*

**Agree.**

*3.b.3: That the Town, York and the TRCA/Rouge Park Alliance introduce "You are entering Rouge Park" signage.*

**Agree with this recommendation and suggest that this action be coordinated with actions recommended in 1C.**

*3.c: That staff develop a heritage building preservation strategy for Greater Rouge Park using principles enunciated in this report and that they work with Public Works Canada, the TRCA, and the Alliance to create a heritage subdivision and infill lots for the protection and concentration of moved heritage buildings.*

**This should be subject to further discussion by the Alliance.**

*3.d.1: That the draft Little Rouge Corridor and Bob Hunter Management Plans be amended to permit the privatization of residential properties under the strict conditions outlined in this report and that this approach apply to all such properties in Greater Rouge Park.*

*3.d.2: That staff assist all public entities holding residential properties in Greater Rouge Park to proceed to privatize the residential properties in the Park.*

**These recommendations are contrary to the conditions of purchase from ORC,: those terms do not permit the sale of property. It is also contrary to the position of the Rouge Park Alliance.**

**To be referred to the Rouge Park Organization and Financial Review Steering Committee and to the Province regarding the Greenbelt Plan.**

*3.e.1: That staff and the Alliance place a high priority on the preparation of an agriculture master plan for Greater Rouge Park, and that consultation with all stakeholders commence as soon as possible.*

**Agriculture is already a component of all Rouge Park management plans and consultation with stakeholders is part of each management planning process. As well, Rouge Park staff is working to develop a more general set of guiding principles and strategy for agriculture in the Park. We look forward to presenting an overall agriculture strategy for discussion this fall.**

*3.e.2: That no further plantings be permitted after those scheduled for next spring until the agriculture master plan has been completed and approved by Markham Council.*

**Do not agree. This proposed action would halt restoration plans for Bob Hunter Memorial Park and the Little Rouge Corridor completely. We are bringing back revised plans after consultation with the farm tenants and other parties.**

*3.f: That staff notify the Province, ORC, TRCA, York Region and the Alliance that Markham's priority is for employment uses on the Reesor Road parcel.*

**This matter is currently under review by a joint York, Markham, TRCA, ORC and Rouge Park Alliance working group with the aid of a consultant. The parties have invested \$50,000 in the study and should not have conditions imposed by either Markham or Rouge Park Alliance.**

**Furthermore, Markham's position is not consistent with their focus on the preservation of prime agriculture land.**

*4.a.1: That Council initiate a Rouge Park governance review.*

**The governance review is underway, involving all stakeholders in Rouge Park Alliance.**

4.a.2/3: That Council include \$150,000 in its 2009 budget as a Rouge Park Operating and Small Capital Projects Grant to be held for Council release pending the satisfactory results of the governance and operating review.  
4.a.4: That Markham and York Region each give positive consideration to a target of an annual Operating and Small Capital Projects Grant to Rouge Park of \$1,000,000, through a seven-year escalating process, pending a satisfactory outcome of discussions with their partners on governance, operations and the many other matters raised in this report.

**Referred to the Rouge Park Organization and Finance Review Steering Committee with noted thanks for the thoughtful offer.**

4.b: That staff establish a municipal staff liaison committee, consisting of representatives from all municipalities, the TRCA and Rouge Park to address implementation issues in a timely and consistent approach.

**Agree and look forward to this process.**

5.1: That the five Town environmental programmes be expanded to include a specific minimum percentage for community participation activities and that staff report back with detailed recommendations.

5.2: That the Environmental Land Acquisition Fund include an allocation portion for specific Rouge Park projects and that staff report back with detailed recommendations.

5.3: That staff develop an MOU to be used when Markham funds are used to purchase properties that will be held by other governments or agencies.

**No comment**

## **Conclusion**

Markham has done a very thorough job of identifying the many issues and outstanding tasks that need resolution. It is recognized that the 1994 Rouge Park Management Plan that was developed for the City of Toronto still sets the Vision, Goals, Objectives and Principles for Rouge North and Rouge East.

It is also recognized that the Rouge Park Land in Markham is more encompassing. It covers three watersheds, a larger agriculture community and two settlement areas rich in heritage and culture. It is surrounded by new communities in both York and Durham and the folks that live there look forward to enjoying this wonderful Rouge Park

The Markham portion of the Park must respect the past and plan for the future. It must instil the values of Rouge Park while reflecting the needs of Markham. This can only be achieved by all members of the Rouge Park Alliance and other stakeholders working together.

**Report prepared by:**

**For information contact:**

**Date:** September 10, 2009

Alan Wells and Rouge Park Management Staff, Rouge Park Alliance  
Alan Wells, 905-713-7426, email: [awells@rougepark.com](mailto:awells@rougepark.com)





# Appendix C

## Status of RPITF Revised Recommendations and Rouge Park Alliance Response

<b>RPITF revised recommendation October 27, 2009 As adopted by Council</b>	<b>Rouge Park Staff Response September 15, 2009 As adopted by Rouge Park Alliance</b>	<b>Status /Next Steps</b>	<b>Gov' Review Process</b>	<b>Ongoing Planning Processes</b>
<b>1.a.1</b> That the Town establish a municipal park in east Markham called "Rouge Park".	Referred to the Rouge Park Organization and Finance Review Steering Committee.	Dependent on Federal Government response to the National Park. To be addressed in Founding Deal	✓	
<b>1.a.2</b> That the Little Rouge Creek Corridor, Bob Hunter Memorial Park, Eastern Markham and Tompion lands be included in Rouge Park, and that Toogood Pond Park, Milne Dam Conservation Area and the Middle Reaches north of Major Mackenzie not be included in Rouge Park.	Referred to the Rouge Park Organization and Finance Review Steering Committee.	Dependent on Federal Government response to the National Park. To be addressed in Founding Deal	✓	
<b>1.a.3</b> That the lands and properties owned by the Town of Markham known as "Cedarena", "Cedar Grove Community Park", and "Cedar Grove Community Centre" continue to be owned and managed by Markham.	<b>Agreed.</b> provided that the management is in the context of an overall Rouge Park Plan.	Discussion not yet initiated with the TRCA about the possible conveyance of the Cedarena lands to the Town. All the other facilities are Town owned but programmed by the local community.		✓
<b>1.a.4</b> That staff enter into negotiations with the MTO, ORC and TRCA to complete the transfer of remnant parcels of land in east Markham to the Town or to the future Rouge Park.	<b>Agree</b> with this recommendation provided that the Chair of Rouge Park Alliance is included in the negotiations.			✓
<b>1.b.1</b> That the Town discuss with the Federal Government integration of the federal airport lands in Markham into Rouge Park.	<b>Agree.</b> The Federal Airport lands include the upper reaches of the Rouge Watershed and serve as a critical ecological link to the Oak Ridges Moraine.	Dependent on Federal Government response to the National Park.	✓	
<b>1.b.2</b> That the Town coordinate efforts with the Federal Government, the TRCA, and Rouge Park Alliance to implement the Green Space vision in a manner consistent with its vision and the objectives of the TRCA, Rouge Park and the Town.	<b>Agree</b> that a coordinated approach is essential to realizing the Green Space vision.	Dependent on Federal Government response to the National Park.	✓	

## Appendix C

### Status of RPITF Revised Recommendations and Rouge Park Alliance Response

RPITF revised recommendation October 27, 2009 As adopted by Council	Rouge Park Staff Response September 15, 2009 As adopted by Rouge Park Alliance	Status /Next Steps	Gov' Review Process	Ongoing Planning Processes
1.c That the Town engage the Rouge Park Alliance, TRCA, the Region, Province and the Federal Government to establish appropriate names for distinct areas and features within Greater Rouge Park. Such a process would recognize historic and current local contexts and include community consultation.	Agree	It would be appropriate to initiate this process once the long term management of the Park has been determined. A public engagement process should be undertaken with all stakeholders		✓
2.a.1 That ecologically focused camping be permitted within Rouge Park and that a small number of sites be located after criteria are established by staff and the Alliance, and that one of the sites be large enough to handle group camping.	Agree that a small number of wilderness camping sites would be appropriate within the Park. Further discussion will be needed in order to plan for site locations, facilities and services.	To be addressed in Management Plans.		✓
2.a.2 That RPITF support a small amount of RV camping in Rouge Park subject to a cost-benefit analysis.	<b>Do not agree with creating more RV camping</b> sites within the Park. RV camping is inconsistent with the goals and intent of Rouge Park.	Deferred by Council for further discussion on October 27, 2009.		✓
2.b That staff work with Rouge Park Alliance and interested community groups in securing dog off-leash areas inside Rouge Park.	The Alliance has directed Rouge Park staff to work with partners to identify potential dog off-leash areas.	Underway. This is being addressed by Rouge Park		✓
2.c.1 That Rouge Park be requested to review potential locations for a large group picnic area, in the East Markham Rouge Park lands and that implementation be considered a priority.	<b>Agree</b> that a large group picnic area can be accommodated in the Park and we will work with partners, including Markham, to identify a suitable site.	To be addressed in Management Plans		✓
2.c.2 That in light of staff concerns regarding smaller picnic site, the Rouge Park should carefully consider the location and number of these sites proposed. Consideration should be given to a celebration forest and an arboretum/horticultural garden area.	<b>Agree</b> that a number of small picnic sites would be appropriate near trailheads and parking areas. A arboretum/horticultural garden would be inconsistent with the ecological focus of the Park.	Underway. Addressed in Trails Master Plan Study. A Steering Committee chaired by RP staff has been established including Town of Markham staff.		✓
		Terms of reference for the study have been developed and an		

# Appendix C

## Status of RPITF Revised Recommendations and Rouge Park Alliance Response

RPITF revised recommendation October 27, 2009 As adopted by Council	Rouge Park Staff Response September 15, 2009 As adopted by Rouge Park Alliance	Status /Next Steps	Gov' Review Process	Ongoing Planning Processes
2.d.1 That staff and the Alliance treat with the highest priority the preparation of a detailed Rouge Park trails and pathways plan, especially in Eastern Markham and the Little Rouge Corridor.	Agree Funds are included in the Rouge Park 2009 budget to start this process. The Town has approved an allocation of \$50,000 to this study.	RFP will be issued shortly. Issues regarding servicing/maintenance would be addressed in any future MOU. Underway. Addressed in Trails Master Plan Study. A Steering Committee chaired by RP staff has been established including Town of Markham staff. Terms of reference for the study have been developed and an RFP will be issued shortly.		✓
2.d.2 That until such a trails and pathways plan is approved, that staff identify appropriate locations for trails and parking, and protect for them, on all pending site restoration in Rouge Park.		Ongoing. The Town is currently working with Rouge Park to ensure public use locations are protected within restoration plans.		✓
2.d.3 That staff and the Alliance ensure that some Rouge Park attractions be located near the YRT/VIVA terminal and the Havelock GO stations, and that enough parking be available at each entry node and trailhead so that traffic is not impeded and that no parking overflow occurs in the residential areas in or near Rouge Park.		To be addressed in Management Plans		✓
2.e.1, 2.e.2, 2.e.3 That staff and the Alliance identify a location for an outdoor activity centre in Eastern Markham. That staff and the Alliance identify a location for a park maintenance facility in Eastern Markham. That staff and the Alliance identify a location for an outdoor cultural centre in Eastern Markham, for plays, music, nature lectures and	The management planning process for the East Markham lands is currently underway and a steering committee has been formed. The potential for an outdoor activity/cultural centre will form part of this management planning	To be addressed in Management Plans		✓

## Appendix C

### Status of RPITF Revised Recommendations and Rouge Park Alliance Response

RPITF revised recommendation October 27, 2009 As adopted by Council	Rouge Park Staff Response September 15, 2009 As adopted by Rouge Park Alliance	Status /Next Steps	Gov' Review Process	Ongoing Planning Processes
volunteer planting activity coordination.	discussion.			
2.f.1, 2.f.2 That the Alliance be advised that the Town supports the relocation of Rouge Park offices to the Park in Markham and encourages Rouge Park to commence review of their office/interpretive centre requirements with a vision of locating in or near the Park. That the Town make every effort to assist Rouge Park in finding a suitable location at a reasonable cost.	We welcome this recommendation.	To be addressed in Management Plans	✓	✓
2.f.3 That the relationship between the Markham Museum and Rouge Park be formalized and that staff explore all opportunities to develop a shared experience for the visiting public	Agree Rouge Park staff is currently working on partnership initiatives with the Markham Museum.	The Town is working in partnership with the TRCA, Rouge Park, York Region and area municipalities to develop and promote Rouge Days from May 26 to 29 <sup>th</sup> . A fishing event is planned for May 27 <sup>th</sup> and Arts, & Culture night at the Markham Museum.		✓
2.g.1 Recommended land use and recreation activities	Generally, Rouge Park staff recommend that only low-impact nature appreciation activities be permitted in the Park. Other activities can be concentrated in a small number of areas designated for more intensive public use including the outdoor activity centre.	To be addressed in Management Plans		✓
2.g.2 That the Town review By-law 323-86 to ensure that bows and arrows and crossbows are specifically prohibited in the Rouge Park. In addition the Town should request greater monitoring and enforcement by MNR and York Police to prevent hunting in Rouge	Agree that this must be a priority and enforcement effects must include all enforcement agencies.	Town staff will be bringing forward an amendment to the by-law in May 2010.		✓

# Appendix C

## Status of RPITF Revised Recommendations and Rouge Park Alliance Response

RPITF revised recommendation October 27, 2009 As adopted by Council	Rouge Park Staff Response September 15, 2009 As adopted by Rouge Park Alliance	Status /Next Steps	Gov' Review Process	Ongoing Planning Processes
Park..				
3.a.1 That the Town and the Alliance support the planning of necessary infrastructure improvements, such as road widenings, sewer projects, transit enhancements, etc., in a manner that provides opportunities for enhanced environmental benefits in support of the goals and objectives of Rouge Park	Agree	To be addressed in Founding Deal.	✓	✓
3.a.2 To rely on the Region, the TRCA and MOE to continuously monitor groundwater withdrawals for the Stouffville community to ensure sustainable stream flow in affected tributaries		Underway – Region of York is continuing to monitor the groundwater situation.		✓
3.b.1 That the Town support watercourse crossing signage to identify watersheds(Don, Duffins, Highland, Petticoat and Rouge) for crossings of watercourses with official names except that, inside Rouge Park, the signs would identify the Park rather than the watershed.	Agree.	Underway		✓
3.b.2 That the Town endorse in principle the proposal of the Don Watershed Regeneration Council for watercourse crossing signage	Agree.	Underway		✓
3.b.3 That the Town, York and the TRCA/Rouge Park Alliance introduce "You are entering Rouge Park" signage along the lines discussed in this report.	Agree and suggest that this action be coordinated with actions recommended in IC.	Entrance signs are erected		✓
3.c That staff develop a heritage building preservation strategy for Greater Rouge Park using principles enunciated in this report and that they work with Public Works Canada, the TRCA, and the Alliance to create a heritage subdivision and infill lots for the protection and concentration of moved heritage buildings.	This should be subject to further discussion by the Alliance	To be addressed in Founding Deal. Further, the Town is currently undertaking a Town wide Threatened Heritage Building Study to address future heritage building preservation in the Town.	✓	
3.d.1 That the residential lease arrangements in Greater Rouge Park be reviewed to permit privatization of dwelling units and, for the lands	These recommendations are contrary to the conditions of purchase from ORC and the position of the Rouge	To be addressed in Founding Deal. Rouge Park Alliance have endorsed a new lease strategy	✓	✓

## Appendix C

### Status of RPITF Revised Recommendations and Rouge Park Alliance Response

<b>RPITF revised recommendation October 27, 2009 As adopted by Council</b>	<b>Rouge Park Staff Response September 15, 2009 As adopted by Rouge Park Alliance</b>	<b>Status /Next Steps</b>	<b>Gov' Review Process</b>	<b>Ongoing Planning Processes</b>
supporting the dwelling units, longer term land leases or other innovative approaches in order to provide greater security for tenants/owners and provide incentives for ongoing property maintenance and repairs.	Park Alliance.	(March 12, 2010)		
<b>3.e.1</b> That staff and the Alliance continue to coordinate long-term agricultural protection policies for the Rouge Park which would be finalized through the Markham East Lands Study.	Underway. Agricultural policies endorsed by the Rouge Park Alliance	Revised termination of agricultural lease approach endorsed by RPA on March 12, 2010.	✓	✓
<b>3.e.2</b> That the TRCA not cancel any agricultural leases on lands farmed for the last 5 years in favour of natural heritage restoration until an agricultural transition plan has been prepared and endorsed by Markham Council.	Do not agree. This proposed action would halt restoration plans for Bob Hunter Memorial Park and the Little Rouge Corridor. Consultation underway with the farm tenants and other parties.	Revised termination of agricultural lease approach endorsed by RPA on March 12, 2010.		✓
<b>3.f</b> That staff notify the Province, ORC, TRCA, York Region and the Alliance that Markham's priority is for employment uses on the Reesor Road parcel and that Markham would be interested in exploring ecological enhancements for the site in the context of an upscale business campus. (This recommendation was deferred for further discussion).	This matter is currently under review by a joint York, Markham, TRCA, ORC and Rouge Park Alliance working group.	Underway		✓
<b>4.a.1</b> That the Town supports the Governance Review process and request an opportunity to make an early input into the review.	The governance review is underway, involving all stakeholders in Rouge Park Alliance.	Underway	✓	
<b>4.a.2</b> That Council and York Region each give positive consideration to an annual Operating and Small Capital Projects Grant through an escalating process, pending a satisfactory outcome of discussions with their partners on governance, operations and the many other matters raised in this report.	Referred to the Rouge Park Organization and Finance Review Steering Committee with noted thanks for the thoughtful offer.		✓	

## Appendix C

### Status of RPITF Revised Recommendations and Rouge Park Alliance Response

RPITF revised recommendation October 27, 2009 As adopted by Council	Rouge Park Staff Response September 15, 2009 As adopted by Rouge Park Alliance	Status /Next Steps	Gov' Review Process	Ongoing Planning Processes
4.b That staff establish a municipal staff liaison committee, consisting of representatives from all municipalities, the TRCA and Rouge Park to address implementation issues in a timely and consistent approach.	Agree	To be addressed in April meetings between Town staff, Rouge Park and TRCA .		✓
5.. 5.2, 5.3 That the Town environmental programmes which are consistent with Rouge Park objectives be expanded to include a specific minimum percentage for community participation activities in Rouge Park, and that staff report back with detailed recommendations. That the Environmental Land Acquisition Fund include an allocation portion for specific Rouge Park land acquisition and that staff report back with detailed recommendations. That staff develops an MOU to be used when Markham funds are used to purchase properties that will be held by other governments or agencies.	No comment	Underway	✓	✓

