



# Rouge River Watershed

## Scenario Modelling and Analysis Report

Prepared by:

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority  
5 Shoreham Drive  
Downsview, ON  
M3N 1S4

FINAL 2007



## Acknowledgements

The *Rouge River Watershed Scenario Modelling and Analysis Report* represents the combined effort of many participants. The report was prepared by technical staff of the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (listed in Appendix B) with input from Rouge Park staff, consultants, government partners and the Rouge Watershed Task Force. Appreciation and thanks are extended to all those who contributed.



Disclaimer: The views and ideas in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of Environment Canada. Any mention of trade names, commercial products, or supplier names does not constitute endorsement or recommendation of use.



This product has received funding support from the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. Such support does not indicate endorsement by the Ministry of the contents of the material.



ISBN 978-0-9811107-0-7

[www.trca.on.ca](http://www.trca.on.ca)

5 Shoreham Drive,  
Toronto, ON M3N 1S4

Phone: 416-661-6600  
Fax: 416-661-6898

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1-2</b>
1.1 References	1-5
<b>2.0 SETTING AND KEY ISSUES</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 Climate	2-1
2.2 Physiography, Topography, and Soils	2-3
2.3 Geology	2-5
2.4 Hydrogeology	2-7
2.5 Land use	2-14
2.6 Key Issues	2-16
2.7 References	2-18
<b>3.0 INTEGRATED STUDY DESIGN</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1 Study questions	3-1
3.2 Land Use and Management Scenarios	3-1
3.3 Predictive Modelling and Analysis Tools	3-5
3.4 Analysis and Evaluation	3-9
3.5 Watershed and Subwatershed Units	3-12
3.6 References	3-13
<b>4.1 Surface Water Quantity</b>	<b>4.1-6</b>
4.1.1 Key Indicators	4.1-6
4.1.2 Modelling Methods	4.1-8
4.1.3 Effect of Conventional Urban Development	4.1-21
4.1.4 Effect of End-of-Pipe Stormwater Retrofit	4.1-51
4.1.5 Effect of Enhanced Natural Cover	4.1-56
4.1.6 Effect of Sustainable Communities	4.1-64
4.1.7 Effect of Climate Change	4.1-64
4.1.8 Summary and Conclusions	4.1-64
4.1.9 Management Considerations	4.1-64
4.1.10 References	4.1-64
<b>4.2 Surface Water Quality</b>	<b>4.2-1</b>
4.2.1 Key Indicators	4.2-1
4.2.2 Modelling Methods	4.2-3
4.2.3 Baseline Conditions	4.2-6
4.2.4 Effects of Conventional Urban Development	4.2-8
4.2.5 Effects of End-of-Pipe Stormwater Retrofit	4.2-17
4.2.6 Effects of Expanded Natural Cover	4.2-18
4.2.7 Effects of 'Sustainable' Communities	4.2-21
4.2.8 Effects of Climate Change	4.2-25
4.2.9 Summary and Conclusions	4.2-30
4.2.10 Management Considerations	4.2-30
4.2.11 References	4.2-32

## Rouge River Watershed Scenario Modelling and Analysis Report

<b>4.3</b>	<b>Groundwater</b>	<b>4.3-1</b>
4.3.1	Key Indicators	4.3-1
4.3.2	Modelling Methods	4.3-2
4.3.3	Existing Conditions	4.3-10
4.3.4	Effects of Conventional Urban Development	4.3-12
4.3.5	Effects of End of Pipe Stormwater Retrofit	4.3-22
4.3.6	Effects of Expanded Natural Cover	4.3-23
4.3.7	Effects of Sustainable Communities	4.3-29
4.3.8	Effects of Climate Change	4.3-40
4.3.9	Summary of Water Budget Effects	4.3-51
4.3.10	Summary and Conclusions	4.3-54
4.3.11	Management Considerations	4.3-55
4.3.12	References	4.3-57
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Aquatic System</b>	<b>4.4-1</b>
4.4.1	Key Indicators	4.4-1
4.4.2	Aquatic System Analysis Methods	4.4-2
4.4.3	Baseline Conditions	4.4-22
4.4.4	Effects of Conventional Urban Development	4.4-23
4.4.5	Effects of End of Pipe Stormwater Retrofit	4.4-25
4.4.6	Effects of Expanded Natural Cover	4.4-26
4.4.7	Effects of Sustainable Communities	4.4-26
4.4.8	Effects of Climate Change	4.4-27
4.4.9	Aquatic Evaluation of Findings from Other Technical Disciplines	4.4-27
4.4.10	Summary of Scenario Results	4.4-33
4.4.11	Conclusions	4.4-34
4.4.12	Management Considerations	4.4-35
4.4.13	References	4.4-38
<b>4.5</b>	<b>Terrestrial Natural Heritage System</b>	<b>4.5-1</b>
4.5.1	Key Indicators	4.5-1
4.5.2	Terrestrial Natural Heritage Analysis Methods	4.5-3
4.5.3	Development of a Targeted Terrestrial Natural Heritage System	4.5-5
4.5.4	Scenarios of Focus for Terrestrial Natural Heritage Evaluation	4.5-6
4.5.5	Baseline (2002) Conditions	4.5-7
4.5.6	Effects of Conventional Urban Development	4.5-10
4.5.7	Effects of End-of-Pipe Stormwater Retrofit	4.5-12
4.5.8	Effects of Expanded Natural Cover	4.5-14
4.5.9	Effects of Sustainable Communities	4.5-18
4.5.10	Effects of Climate Change	4.5-19
4.5.11	Summary and Conclusions	4.5-21
4.5.12	Management Considerations	4.5-22
4.5.13	References	4.5-24
<b>4.6</b>	<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	<b>4.6-1</b>
4.6.1	Key Indicators	4.6-1
4.6.2	Cultural Heritage Analysis Methods	4.6-1
4.6.3	Baseline Conditions	4.6-3
4.6.4	Effects of Future Land Use and Management Scenarios	4.6-6

## Rouge River Watershed Scenario Modelling and Analysis Report

4.6.5	Effects of Climate Change	4.6-7
4.6.6	Summary and Conclusions	4.6-7
4.6.7	Management Considerations	4.6-7
4.6.8	References	4.6-9
<b>4.7</b>	<b>Nature-based Recreation</b>	<b>4.7-1</b>
4.7.1	Key Indicators	4.7-1
4.7.2	Scenario Analysis Methods	4.7-3
4.7.3	Baseline Conditions	4.7-6
4.7.4	Effects of Conventional Urban Development	4.7-9
4.7.5	Effects of End of Pipe Stormwater Retrofit	4.7-13
4.7.6	Effects of Expanded Natural Cover	4.7-13
4.7.7	Effects of Sustainable Communities	4.7-14
4.7.8	Effects of Climate Change	4.7-14
4.7.9	Summary and Conclusions	4.7-15
4.7.10	Management Considerations	4.7-15
4.7.11	References	4.7-17
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Summary and Recommendations</b>	<b>5-2</b>
5.1	Integrated Study Design	5-2
5.2	Summary of Scenario Modelling Results	5-4
5.3	Recommendations for Watershed Management	5-12
5.4	Use of the Study Results	5-13

### APPENDIX A: Scenario Descriptions and Assumptions

Introduction		A1
Scenario 1	Baseline conditions (2002)	A-4
Scenario 2	Official Plan Build-out	A-5
Scenario 3	End-of-pipe Stormwater retrofit	A-7
Scenario 4	Expanded Natural Cover	A-8
Scenario 5	End-of-pipe stormwater retrofit and expanded natural cover	A-9
Scenario 6	Full Build-out	A-10
Scenario 7	Sustainable community programs in new and existing developments	A-11
Scenario 8	Climate Change with Full Build-out – with and without Sustainable Community Elements	A-19

### APPENDIX B

Technical Support	B-1
List of Supporting Documents to Rouge River Watershed Planning Study	B-2

## Rouge River Watershed Scenario Modelling and Analysis Report

### LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1	Rouge River Watershed	1-2
Figure 1-2	Watershed Response Model	1-3
Figure 2-1	Long Term Climate Trends	2-2
Figure 2-2	Physigraphic Regions	2-3
Figure 2-3	Stratigraphic Schematic	2-5
Figure 2-4	Surficial Geology	2-6
Figure 2-5	Geologic Cross Section - Main Rouge River	2-8
Figure 2-6	Geologic Cross Section – Bruce Creek Main Rouge River	2-9
Figure 2-7	Geologic Cross Section - Little Rouge River	2-10
Figure 2-8	Groundwater Levels, Oak Ridges Aquifer (EarthFx, 2004)	2-13
Figure 2-9	2002 Land Use Conditions	2-15
Figure 3-1	Rouge Watershed Response Model and Predictive Tools	3-6
Figure 3-2	Subwatershed Units	3-12
Figure 4.1-1	Streamflow Gauge Locations, Baseflow Monitoring Locations, and Location of Buttonville Airport Meteorological Station	4.1-11
Figure 4.1-2	Location of HSP-F Model Output Locations	4.1-14
Figure 4.1-3	Rouge River Watershed Hydrologic Soil Group Distribution	4.1-17
Figure 4.1-4	Catchment Areas for HSP-F Model Output Locations	4.1-19
Figure 4.1-5	Change in Total Annual Flow Volumes - Approved Official Plan Build-out (Scenario 2) vs. 2002 Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-24
Figure 4.1-6	Change in Total Annual Flow Volumes - Full Build-out (Scenario 6) vs. Approved Official Plan Build-out (Scenario 2)	4.1-25
Figure 4.1-7	Change in Total Annual Flow Volumes - Full Build-out (Scenario 6) vs. 2002 Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-26
Figure 4.1-8	Differences in Seasonal Flow Volumes - Approved Official Plan Build-out (Scenario 2) vs. 2002 Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-27
Figure 4.1-9	Differences in Seasonal Flow Volume - Full Build-out (Scenario 6) vs. Approved Official Plan Build-out (Scenario 2)	4.1-28
Figure 4.1-10	Differences in Seasonal Flow Volume - Full Build-out (Scenario 6) vs. 2002 Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-28
Figure 4.1-11	Change in Flow Duration at Selected Frequencies - Approved Official Plan Build-out (Scenario 2) vs. 2002 Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-30
Figure 4.1-12	Change in Flow Duration at Selected Frequencies – Full Build-out (Scenario 6) vs. 2002 Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-31
Figure 4.1-13	HSP-F Hourly Output for May20/21 1996 Event at Upper Rouge River upstream of Beaver Creek Confluence – Full Build-Out (Scenario 6), Approved Official Plan Build-Out (Scenario 2) and Existing 2002 Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-36
Figure 4.1-14	HSP-F Hourly Output for May20/21 1996 Event at Bruce Creek near Rouge River Confluence – Full Build-out (Scenario 6), Approved Official Plan Build-Out (Scenario 2) and Existing 2002 Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-37

## Rouge River Watershed Scenario Modelling and Analysis Report

Figure 4.1-15	Change in Erosion Potential Approved Official Plan Build-out (Scenario 2) vs. 2002 Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-39
Figure 4.1-16	Change in Erosion Potential – Full Build-out (Scenario 6) vs. Approved Official Plan Build-out (Scenario 2)	4.1-40
Figure 4.1-17	Change in Erosion Potential – Full Build-out (Scenario 6) vs. 2002 Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-41
Figure 4.1-18	Modelled Reductions to Groundwater Discharge – Approved OP Build-out (Scenario 2) vs. Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-45
Figure 4.1-19	Modelled Reductions to Groundwater Discharge – Full Build-out (Scenario 6) vs. Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-46
Figure 4.1-20	Change in Flow Duration at Selected Frequencies – End-of-Pipe Stormwater Retrofits (Scenario 3) vs. Official Plan Build-out (Scenario 2)	4.1-53
Figure 4.1-21	HSP-F Output for April 1991 events at Beaver Creek Outlet – Approved Official Plan Build-out (Scenario 2) and Approved OP Build-Out with End-of-Pipe Retrofit (Scenario 3)	4.1-54
Figure 4.1-22	Change in Erosion Potential – Approved OP Build-out with End-of-Pipe Retrofit (Scenario 3) vs. Approved OP Build-out (Scenario 2)	4.1-55
Figure 4.1-23	Difference in Total Annual Flow Volumes – Approved OP Build-out with Enhanced Natural Cover (Scenario 4) vs. Approved OP Build-out (Scenario 2)	4.1-58
Figure 4.1-24	Changes in Total Annual Flow Volumes Approved OP Build-out with Enhanced Natural Cover Scenario (Scenario 4) vs. 2002 Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-59
Figure 4.1-25	Change in Seasonal Flow Volume – Approved OP Build-out with Enhanced Natural Cover (Scenario 4) vs. Approved OP Build-out (Scenario 2)	4.1-60
Figure 4.1-26	Change in Seasonal Flow Volume Approved OP Build-out with Enhanced Natural Cover (Scenario 4) vs. 2002 Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-61
Figure 4.1-27	Change in Flow Duration at Selected Frequencies – Approved OP Build-out with Enhanced Natural Cover (Scenario 4) vs. OP Build-out (Scenario 2)	4.1-62
Figure 4.1-28	HSP-F Output for April 1991 Rainfall Events at Main Rouge River at Confluence with Beaver Creek – Approved OP Build-out with Enhanced Natural Cover (Scenario 4) and Approved OP Build-out (Scenario 2)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-29	HSP-F Output for May 1996 Rainfall Event at Main Rouge River at Confluence with Beaver – Approved OP Build-out with Enhanced Natural Cover (Scenario 4) and Approved OP Build-out (Scenario 2)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-30	Change in Erosion Potential Approved OP Build-out with Enhanced Natural Cover (Scenario 4) vs. Approved OP Build-out (Scenario 2)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-31	Change in Erosion Potential – OP Build-out with Enhanced Natural Cover (Scenario 4) vs. Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-32	Modelled Increases to Groundwater Discharge - OP Build-out with Enhanced Natural Cover (Scenario 4) vs. Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-33	Differences in Total Annual Flow Volumes – Sustainable Communities (Scenario 7) vs. Full Build-out (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-34	Differences in Total Annual Flow Volumes – Sustainable Communities (Scenario 7) vs. 2002 Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-64

## Rouge River Watershed Scenario Modelling and Analysis Report

Figure 4.1-35	Change in Seasonal Flow Volumes - Sustainable Communities (Scenario 7) vs. Full Build-out (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-36	Change in Seasonal Flow Volumes - Sustainable Communities (Scenario 7) vs. Existing Conditions (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-37	Change in Flow Duration at Selected Frequencies – Sustainable Communities (Scenario 7) vs. Full Build-out (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-38	Change in Flow Duration at Selected Frequencies – Sustainable Communities (Scenario 7) vs. Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-39	Change in Erosion Potential – Sustainable Communities (Scenario 7) vs. Full Build-out (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-40	Change in Erosion Potential – Sustainable Communities (Scenario 7) vs. Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-41	Simulated Increases in Groundwater Discharge - Sustainable Communities (Scenario 7) vs. Full Build-out (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-42	Simulated Decreases in Groundwater Discharge - Sustainable Communities (Scenario 7) vs. Full Build-out (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-43	Simulated Decreases in Groundwater Recharge - Sustainable Communities (Scenario 7) vs. Full Build-out (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-44	Monthly Temperature and Precipitation Change Fields from Global Climate Change Model Scenarios used in the HSP-F modelling	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-45	Change in Annual Flow Volume – CGCM2 Scenario with Full Build-out Land Use (Scenario 8a) vs. Full Build-out with Existing Climate (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-46	Changes in Total Annual Flow Volume – Hadley Scenario with Full Build-out Land Use (Scenario 8b) vs. Full Build-out with Existing Climate (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-47	Change in Total Annual Flow Volume – CGCM Scenario with Sustainable Communities Land Use (Scenario 8c) vs. Sustainable Communities with Existing Climate (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-48	Change in Total Annual Flow Volume – Hadley Scenario with Full Build-out Land Use (Scenario 8d) vs. Full Build-Out with Existing Climate (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-49	Changes in Seasonal Flow Volumes – CGCM Climate Scenario with Full Build-out Land Use (Scenario 8a) vs. Full Build-out with Existing Climate (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-50	Changes in Seasonal Flow Volumes – Hadley Climate Scenario with Full Build-out Land Use (Scenario 8b) vs. Full Build-out with Existing Climate (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-51	Change in Flow Duration at Selected Frequencies – CGCM2 Climate Scenario with Full Build-out Land Use (Scenario 8a) vs. Full Build-out with Existing Climate (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-52	Change in Flow Duration at Selected Frequencies – Hadley Climate Scenario with Full Build-out Land Use (Scenario 8b) vs. Full Build-out with Existing Climate (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-53	Hourly HSP-F Output for Simulated April 1991 Events Main Rouge River at Steeles Avenue – Climate Change Scenarios with Full Build-out Land Use (Scenarios 8a and 8b), Full Build-out (Scenario 6), and Existing Conditions (Scenario 2)	4.1-64



## Rouge River Watershed Scenario Modelling and Analysis Report

Figure 4.1-54	Hourly HSP-F Output for Simulated April 1991 Events Main Rouge River at Steeles Avenue – Climate Change Scenarios with Full Build-out Land Use (Scenarios 8a and 8b), Full Build-out (Scenario 6), and Existing Conditions (Scenario 2)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-55	Change in Erosion Potential – CGCM Climate Scenario with Full Build-out Land Use (Scenario 8a) vs. Full Build-out with Existing Climate (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.1-56	Change in Erosion Potential – Hadley Climate Scenario with Full Build-out Land Use (Scenario 8a) vs. Full Build-out with Existing Climate (Scenario 6)	4.1-64
Figure 4.2-1	Locations of Regional Water Quality Monitoring Stations and percent of samples collected between 2002 and 2004 that meet guidelines for selected variables	4.2-7
Figure 4.2-2	Impact of future build-out (scenarios 2 and 6) on TSS at or near the outlets of five major subwatersheds	4.2-9
Figure 4.2-3	Flows, TSS concentrations and TSS loads on the Main Rouge (left) and Little Rouge (right) during a large rain event in April 1991	4.2-11
Figure 4.2-4	Impact of build-out (scenarios 2 and 6) on phosphorus, nitrates and TKN at or near the outlet of five major subwatersheds	4.2-12
Figure 4.2-5	Impact of build-out (scenarios 2 and 6) on lead levels at or near the outlets of five major subwatersheds	4.2-13
Figure 4.2-6	Relationships between E.coli/F.coli densities and the extent of urbanization upstream of GTA monitoring stations (Regional Watershed Monitoring Network, 2002-2005).	4.2-14
Figure 4.2-7	Predicted changes in median and 75th percentile bacteria densities with development based on monitoring data collected in the GTA from 2002-2005 (see text for methods). The dashed line represents the E.coli guideline for bathing areas	4.2-15
Figure 4.2-8	Relationships between chloride concentrations and the extent of urbanization upstream of GTA monitoring stations (Regional Watershed Monitoring Network, 2002-2005).	4.2-16
Figure 4.2-9	Predicted changes in median and 75th percentile chloride concentrations with development based on monitoring data collected in the GTA from 2002-2005	4.2-16
Figure 4.2-10	Impact of the Terrestrial Natural Heritage Strategy (scenario 4) on water quality concentrations and loads	4.2-19
Figure 4.2-11	Impact of the Sustainable Communities Scenario on water quality	4.2-23
Figure 4.2-12	The water quality impact of predicted changes in climate (CGCM 2 and Hadley models) on the Full Build-Out Scenario. The Existing Conditions Scenario is shown for comparison.	4.2-27
Figure 4.2-13	The water quality impact of predicted changes in climate (CGCM2 and Hadley models) on the Sustainable Communities Scenario. The Existing Conditions Scenario is shown for comparison.	4.2-28
Figure 4.3-1	Baseflow Separation Techniques (Rouge River at Markham)	4.3-7
Figure 4.3-2	Rouge River Watershed Planning Units	4.3-11
Figure 4.3-3	Decrease in Recharge from Official Plan Build-out	4.3-13

## Rouge River Watershed Scenario Modelling and Analysis Report

Figure 4.3 4	Decrease in Recharge with Full Build-out (compared to Official Plan Build-out)	4.3-14
Figure 4.3-5	Decreases in Oak Ridges Aquifer Water Levels from Official Plan Build-out	4.3-17
Figure 4.3-6	Effect of Full Build-out on Oak Ridges Aquifer Water Levels	4.3-18
Figure 4.3-7	Decrease in Groundwater Discharge from Official Plan Build-out	4.3-19
Figure 4.3-8	Decrease in Groundwater Discharge from Full Build-out	4.3-20
Figure 4.3-9	Increase in Recharge from Expanded Natural Cover	4.3-24
Figure 4.3-10	Decrease in Recharge from Expanded Natural Cover	4.3-25
Figure 4.3-11	Oak Ridges Aquifer Water Level Increase from Expanded Natural Cover	4.3-27
Figure 4.3-12	Decreases in Oak Ridges Aquifer Water Level from Expanded Natural Cover	4.3-28
Figure 4.3-13	Increase in Recharge from Sustainable Community (compared to Full Build-out)	4.3-31
Figure 4.3-14	Decrease in Recharge from Sustainable Community (compared to Full Build-out)	4.3-32
Figure 4.3-15	Increase in Recharge from Sustainable Community (compared to Official Plan Build-out)	4.3-33
Figure 4.3-16	Decrease in Recharge from Sustainable Community (compared to Official Plan Build-out)	4.3-34
Figure 4.3-17	Increases in Oak Ridges Aquifer Water Level from Sustainable Community	4.3-35
Figure 4.3-18	Increases in Thorncliffe Aquifer Water Level from Sustainable Community	4.3-36
Figure 4.3-19	Increases in Groundwater Discharge from Sustainable Community	4.3-37
Figure 4.3-20	Effects of Climate Change with Full Build-out (CGCM2 Model) on Recharge	4.3-41
Figure 4.3-21	Effects of Climate Change on Full Build-out (Hadley Model) on Recharge	4.3-42
Figure 4.3-22	Effect of Climate Change with the Sustainable Community (CGCM2 Model) on Recharge	4.3-43
Figure 4.3-23	Effects of Climate Change with Sustainable Community (Hadley Model) on Recharge	4.3-44
Figure 4.3-24	Increase in Oak Ridges Water Level based on CGCM2 Climate Model	4.3-46
Figure 4.3-25	Increase in Thorncliffe Aquifer Water Level based on Hadley Climate Model	4.3-47
Figure 4.3-26	Increase in Groundwater Discharge from Climate Change (Hadley Model)	4.3-48
Figure 4.3-27	Water Budget Summary by Component	4.3-53
Figure 4.3-28	Water Budget Summary by Scenario	4.3-53
Figure 4.4-1	Rouge River Fisheries Management Zones	4.4-5
Figure 4.4-2	Rouge River IBI Scores	4.4-12
Figure 4.4-3	Fisheries CCA Axis 1 Results by Species Taken from Stanfield, 2005.	4.4-19
Figure 4.4-4	Scenario 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 CAA Axis 1 Results	4.4-25
Figure 4.5-1	Portion of Land Covers in the Rouge River Watershed in 2002 Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.5-8
Figure 4.5-2	Results of the LAM Habitat Quality Analysis for Rouge River Watershed Cover in 2002 Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.5-9

## Rouge River Watershed Scenario Modelling and Analysis Report

Figure 4.5-3	Proportion of Land Covers in the Rouge River Watershed under Official Plan Build-out Conditions (Scenario 2)	4.5-10
Figure 4.5-4	Proportion of Land Covers in the Rouge River Watershed under Full Build-out Conditions (Scenario 6)	4.5-11
Figure 4.5-5	Results of the LAM Habitat Quality Analysis for Rouge River Watershed Cover under Full Build-out Conditions (Scenario 6)	4.5-13
Figure 4.5-6	Proportion of Land Covers in the Rouge River Watershed under Expanded Natural Cover (Scenario 4)	4.5-14
Figure 4.5-7	Results of the LAM habitat quality analysis for Rouge River Watershed cover under implementation of Expanded Natural Cover (Scenario 4)	4.5-15
Figure 4.5-8	Results of the LAM habitat quality analysis for Rouge River Watershed cover in under Sustainable Community (Scenario 7)	4.5-20
Figure 4.6-1	Rouge River Watershed Archaeological Site Potential	4.6-5
Figure 4.7-1	Nature-based Recreational Areas and Experience	4.7-5
Figure 4.7-2	Inter-regional Trails Plan	4.7-7
Figure A-1	Scenario 1 2002 Conditions	A-27
Figure A-2	Scenario 2 Official Plan Build-out	A-28
Figure A-3	Scenario 3 OP Build-out and Stormwater Retrofit	A-29
Figure A-4	TRCA Natural Heritage System Cover	A-30
Figure A-5	OP Build-out, Enhanced Natural Cover & Stormwater Retrofit	A-31
Figure A-6	Scenario 6 Full Build-out	A-32
Figure A-7	Scenario 7 Full Build-out with all Opportunities	A-33

## Rouge River Watershed Scenario Modelling and Analysis Report

### LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1	Conceptual Framework for Development of Scenarios	3-2
Table 3-2	Rouge River Watershed Scenarios	3-3
Table 3-3	Reporting Framework Definitions	3-10
Table 3-4	Indicators Used in Rouge River Watershed Scenario Analysis	3-10
Table 4.1-1	Surface Water Quantity Goals, Objectives, Indicators and Targets	4.1-7
Table 4.1-2	Fluvial Geomorphology Goals, Objectives, Indicators and Targets	4.1-8
Table 4.1-3	HSP-F Model Output Location Descriptions	4.1-15
Table 4.1-4	Output Site Catchment Area Soils Characteristics	4.1-15
Table 4.1-5	Output Site Catchment Area Impervious Surface Coverage	4.1-16
Table 4.1-6	Output Site Catchment Area Natural Cover	4.1-16
Table 4.1-7	Potential Impact Classifications for Surface Water Withdrawals.	4.1-20
Table 4.1-8	Land Use Summary for Conventional Development Scenarios (Scenarios 2 and 6)	4.1-22
Table 4.1-9	Existing and Future Committed Flows VO <sub>2</sub> Model Flows (m <sup>3</sup> /s)	4.1-33
Table 4.1-10	Future Committed and Complete Development VO <sub>2</sub> Model Flows (m <sup>3</sup> /s)	4.1-35
Table 4.1-11	Groundwater Discharge for Conventional Development Scenarios	4.1-44
Table 4.1-12	Land use Summary for Scenario 4 (Approved OP Build-Out with Enhanced Natural Cover), Scenario 2 (Approved OP Build-Out) and Scenario 1 (2002 Existing Conditions)	4.1-56
Table 4.1-13	Groundwater Discharge for Enhanced Natural Cover Scenario	4.1-64
Table 4.1-14	Groundwater Discharge for Sustainable Communities Scenario	4.1-64
Table 4.1-15	Groundwater Discharge for Climate Change Scenarios	4.1-64
Table 4.2-1	Water Quality Goals, Objectives, Indicators and Targets	4.2-2
Table 4.2-2	Removal Efficiencies for Ponds of Various Design	4.2-3
Table 4.2-3:	Average nitrate and phosphorus concentrations for natural (n=5), agricultural (n=11) and urban (n=8) catchments (1990-1994).	4.2-20
Table 4.2-4	Forested (n=16) and agricultural (n=25) wet weather average event mean concentrations used for the Rouge River Watershed in Michigan (1994).	4.2-20
Table 4.3-1	Groundwater Goals, Objectives, Indicators and Targets	4.3-2
Table 4.3-2	Precipitation and Temperature Stations	4.3-5
Table 4.3-3	Environment Canada HYDAT Gauges	4.3-5
Table 4.3-4	Estimate of Baseflow at the Rouge River Gauges	4.3-7
Table 4.3-5	Change in Recharge, Upper Aquifer Water Level <sup>1</sup> and Discharge under Official Plan Build-out	4.3-15
Table 4.3-6	Change in Recharge, Aquifer Level and Discharge: Scenario 6 vs. Scenario 2	4.3-15
Table 4.3-7	Summary of Water Budget Effects	4.3-51
Table 4.4-1	Aquatic System Goals, Objectives, Indicators and Targets	4.4-1
Table 4.4-2	Indices used in TRCA Benthic Aggregate Assessment with Condition/ Criteria and Literature Source(s), 2004	4.4-13

## Rouge River Watershed Scenario Modelling and Analysis Report

Table 4.5-1	Terrestrial System Goals, Objectives, Indicators and Targets	4.5-2
Table 4.5-2	Total Natural Cover Quality Score Ranking Criteria	4.5-4
Table 4.5-3	Rouge River Watershed Scenario Comparison – (A) Percent Natural Cover and (B) Percent Urban Cover	4.5-7
Table 4.5-4	Landscape Analysis Model Results - showing quality of habitat patches under the Land Use in 2002 Existing Conditions (Scenario 1)	4.5-8
Table 4.5-5	Landscape Analysis Model Results - showing quality of habitat patches under Full Build out (Scenario 6)	4.5-12
Table 4.5-6	Landscape Analysis Model Results showing quality of habitat patches under implementation of Expanded Natural Cover (Scenario 4)	4.5-14
Table 4.5-7	Landscape Analysis Model Results showing quality of habitat patches under Sustainable Communities (Scenario 7)	4.5-19
Table 4.6-1	Cultural Heritage Goals, Objectives, Indicators and Targets	4.6-1
Table 4.6-2	Guidelines for Archaeological Potential	4.6-3
Table 4.7 1	Nature-based Recreation Goals, Objectives, Indicators and Targets	4.7-1
Table 4.7 2	Proximity of residential areas to greenspace in the Rouge River watershed (baseline conditions).	4.7-8
Table A-1	Rouge River Watershed Scenarios Selected for Analysis	A-1
Table A-2	Land Cover Characteristics of Rouge River Watershed Scenarios	A-3
Table A-3	Scenario 1 Base Map Assumptions	A-4
Table A-4	Scenario 2 Base Map Assumptions	A-5
Table A-5	Scenario 3 Base Map Assumptions	A-7
Table A-6	Scenario 4 Base Map Assumptions	A-8
Table A-7	Scenario 5 Base Map Assumptions	A-9
Table A-8	Scenario 6 Base Map Assumptions	A-10
Table A-9	Scenario 7 Base Map Assumptions	A-12
Table A-10	Assumed Land Cover Classes, Areas and Percent Imperviousness (Scenario 7)	A-15
Table A-11	Stormwater Management Practices and Application Rates Assumed for the Urban Greenfield Development (Scenario 7)	A-16
Table A-12	Stormwater Management Practices and Application Rates Assumed for the Urban Retrofit (Scenario 7)	A-17
Table A-13	Stormwater Management Practices and Application Rates Assumed for Transportation Corridors (Scenario 7)	A-19
Table A-14	Stormwater Management Practices and Application Rates Assumed for Agricultural Areas (Scenario 7)	A-19
Table A-15	Scenario 8a Assumptions	A-19
Table A-16	Scenario 8b Assumptions	A-20
Table A-17	Scenario 8c Assumptions	A-21
Table A-18	Scenario 8d Assumptions	A-21