

EIS REVIEW (this is a reference list and not an exhaustive assessment list) – Dec 2023

1. Get the context, look at air photos at [London.ca/maps](https://london.ca/maps). Look for 'green and growy', wetlands, aquatic habitat features. Where does that study fall within the larger natural heritage context? Some Significant Wildlife Habitat rely on large contiguous habitat tracts.
2. Look for Map 1 and Map 5 (Natural Heritage System) at: <https://london.ca/government/council-civic-administration/master-plans-strategies/london-plan-official-plan>.
Make a list of the natural heritage features and determine how that overlaps with aerial overview. Do the delineations need to be revised? Were sections missed? If missed, are the patches at least .5 ha?
3. Review the Table of Contents. Look for summary/conclusions, appendices, impact assessments, Significant Wildlife Habitat, maps. Species at Risk locations should be missing.
4. Become familiar with Legislation and Policies which appear at the start of the document.
 - Was the London Plan referenced?
 - Has the 2021 Environmental Management Guidelines (EMGs) been included?
<https://london.ca/ESA>
5. Look for the Scoping Checklist (to ensure all required studies are in the EIS). This list outlines the study requirements and includes the high-level desktop review.
 - What protocols are referenced?
 - Are these carried forward into the Methods section of the report?
 - Are these the correct study protocols?
6. Look at the Field Work – what was found. If a Wetland is in the study area, check the weather and calling stations to see if amphibian calling data collection was done properly under the Marsh Monitoring Protocols -
<https://naturecounts.ca/nc/mmp/resources.jsp?dir=Protocols%20and%20Habitat%20Guide>
7. Summary of proposed work – what is being done? What are the proposed construction methods?
8. Existing Conditions:
 - What are the results of the field studies? Have the ELC delineated ecosites been depicted on a map?
 - Is the feature delineated based on Section 4.8 of the EMGs?
 - If EIS, is the feature delineation consistent with the Subject Land Status Report (SLSR) delineation?
 - If SLSR, feature delineation and assessment of Significance is the key outcome of the report.
9. What is proposed to avoid, mitigate or compensate for impacts on the features and functions?
 - How does the area change during construction and post construction?
 - How will/could construction activities have negative or positive impacts on the site?
 - Are construction activities reported accurately in the impacts assessment? have they left out impacts? Are the limits of disturbance clearly identified on mapping and can construction activities be completed outside of the recommended buffer? The exception would be in cases where a publicly owned park path is placed within the buffer.

10. Species at Risk Screening:

- What species were identified as candidate from the Ecological Land Classification (ELC) layers noted at the beginning of the report?
- What species were noted in the background review?
- Are the habitat conditions (ELC ecosites) appropriate on site for each species? Some can be ruled out based on ELC codes.
- Have appropriate studies been completed to assume absence or confirm presence? Some studies will recommend species specific surveys as next steps.
- Are the ELC codes consistent with, and support, other data collection results?
- See EMGs Appendix C for Data Collection Standards minimum expectations for studies.

11. Wildlife Habitat Assessment / Significant Wildlife Habitat – these areas are to be protected:

<https://www.ontario.ca/page/significant-wildlife-habitat-ecoregional-criteria-schedules-ecoregion-7e>

- What ELC habitat is present? Do these ecosites align with any of the SWH triggers?
- Where the study requirements noted in the 7E schedule completed?

12. Impact Assessment/Net Impact Table.

- Understand the difference between direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts.
- What will be impacted? Was anything missed?
- Are you confident that there will be no negative impact on ecological features and functions?
- If not, include your reasons in your write up.

13. Check to see if the buffers are consistent with the Environmental Management Guidelines - <https://london.ca/ESA>. Note that we buffer development, but mitigate and compensate for infrastructure. Development and infrastructure are governed by separate policies.

14. Have the proponents demonstrated that they have worked through the mitigation hierarchy of Avoid, Minimize, and Mitigate, **before** recommending removal and compensation of features?

15. What are the recommendations and conclusions of the study?

- Are additional studies required?
- What are the next steps?
- If feature re-delineation is required, have they noted the Official Plan Amendment to revise and update Map 1 / Map 5?
- Do you agree that this will result in no negative impact?
- What monitoring has been proposed and is it in line with the EMGs?

16. Write your recommendations and send to the file holders noted in the Scoping Checklist:

- Ecologist
- The City's File planner
- Heather for the agenda
- Proponent's agent if available