

## **BOLER STATUS LAND REPORT**

Reviewed by: K. Delaney, S. Levin, L. Nettagh, C. Peterson  
G. Sass (review of fluvial geomorphology to follow)

### **1. Eastern Meadowlark (page 24)**

Found off site. Question is how will habitat be protected as required under the Ontario Endangered Species Act when the adjacent land (west of Wickerson Road) develops as the city does not have a system for making notes on property?

**Recommendation: Planning Division create a system for tracking these data for undeveloped properties. At a minimum, a note should be created in existing databases for the area.**

2. Page 31 – recommendation does not include in the ESA the FOD 5-1 or the adjacent FOD 5-3 community east of the present ski-hill. FOD 5-1 is noted as not having much Buckthorn and no buckthorn is mentioned in the write up of FOD 5-3.

The final paragraph on page 31 states

“Other woodlands located to the north of the proposed ESA boundary extension were not evaluated as significant woodlands due to existing and proposed development for active recreation, primarily downhill skiing”

This is inconsistent with the very thorough vegetative community studies found on pages 8-13 in the report where the woodlands in questions are clearly listed.

It is unclear as to why what appears to be a significant woodland is to be developed. Page 8 notes the amount of tree cover (> 60%) and understory vegetation (> 60% of the community) with only occasional occurrence of Buckthorn. According to the Boundary Delineation Guideline (# 3 and 9a), the FOD5-1 and FOD5-3 communities noted above should be part of the lands added to the ESA. They are clearly linked between the Dingman Creek ESA south of the road, the woodlands north of the road recommended for inclusion as ESA, and all of the significant woodlands in the central and east central parts of the study area, including Westwood Woods (page 26).

At the bottom of page 31, it appears North-South does not include these areas in the ESA because “of existing and proposed development for active recreation, primarily downhill skiing.” It is unclear if such a use is permitted in the OS2 zone. However, it is clear from the data collected that these communities are significant woodlands and when the boundary delineation guidelines are applied, should be included as part of the ESA.

**Recommendation: a. The FOD 5-1 and FOD 5-3 communities east of the present ski hill be included in the ESA. b. Alternatively, the City utilize its woodland acquisition fund to acquire this part of the ESA. The cost should be reasonably inexpensive given the present zoning (OS2).**

**Recommendation: There are no buffers shown for the proposed ESA or Significant Stream Corridor. as per the City Guidelines. EEPAC recommends that the appropriate ecological buffers be applied to these features and be shown on a map, as prescribed by the City Guidelines. EEPAC anticipates this buffer to be in the range of 10-30 meters.**

3. *Bike trails* – there are a number of bike trails already in areas that have been identified as sensitive (woodland), although not added to the ESA. No protection measures are proposed. The problem seems largest in community FOD7-4 (page 10) but also appears to be in or near community FOD 6-2 which is listed by NHIC as a vulnerable vegetation community (page 9) . To hope for protection, these areas need to become city owned and come under the management of the UTRCA. Otherwise, there will continue to be inappropriate uses in the ESA. As pointed out on page 31, despite the existence of managed bike trails on Boler Mountain property, the city owned lands south of the storm water pond and on the private lands located on the west side of the access road “are impacted by well used campfire rings, unregulated mountain bike trails and BMX bike jumps, forts constructed from scrap wood, etc.”

BMX jumps and party spots – Figure 2 indicates that a BMX bike jump and a party spot were found in the forested vegetation community FOD6-2. On page 9 of the Land Status Report, FOD6-2 is described as vulnerable vegetation community. Page 31 describes the negative impacts that these and other activities have had on the understory and identifies the need for restorative efforts. However, there are no recommendations listed and no reference to who is responsible for carrying out and monitoring the restoration.

Question : Who will be responsible for the restoration and monitoring? What types of restorative measures will be implemented?

Page 31 of the report states that an “active restoration program is required” for areas that have been negatively impacted by unmonitored use.

Question : Where are the details of this restoration program and who will be responsible for implementation and monitoring?

**Recommendation : Devise a restoration program and identify individuals who will be responsible for the implementation and monitoring.**

4. Plans for proposed walking and cycling pathways are described in detail on page 32 of the report. However, the proposed pathways are not clearly marked on any of the accompanying maps. Hydrologic characteristics seem to be missing. These characteristics can help to explain the rationale for identifying and delineating ESA Management Zones. According to the Planning and Design Standards for Trailers in Environmentally Significant Areas, criterion 4 requires understanding of hydrologic characteristics.

**Recommendation : Include the proposed pathways on one the maps, preferably one with the proposed ESA boundary and vegetative communities overlaid.**

**Recommendation: Use hydrologic characteristics to review the proposed Management Zones.**

5. *Recommendation 6 on page 38* states that the Boler Mountain recreation area will continue its programming of compatible recreation use based on the environmental stewardship, protection and management of natural areas and this **may include expansion in to areas recommended for restoration.**

This seems to be inconsistent with what was previously stated in the report. The areas of proposed restoration are in “vulnerable” areas that have already experienced negative impacts as a result of human interference. These areas don’t even have restoration plans in place yet. How can they be used for recreation if they are in vulnerable areas that need restoration?

**Recommendation: A. The Report to be revised to include a recommendation of who will close and remediate bike trails in areas proposed to be designated ESA. Or B. that Boler Mountain be required to prepare and implement such a plan as part of the approval to proceed with its plans.**

**Recommendation: Parks Planning staff add this portion of the Dingman Creek ESA to the management work done by the UTRCA to help maintain the restoration work undertaken in the previous recommendation.**

6. Stream Reaches - Page 34

The report points out that determining an erosion threshold requires additional field investigation in reaches DCT-1 and DCT-4. These reaches are susceptible to changes in flow regime. This information is critical for future storm water management plans.

**Recommendation: The data from this study be provided to the stormwater management group at City Hall for its use in the Environmental Assessment and detail design work for stormwater management that effects these reaches.**

7. Requested Clarifications

page 2 indicates some areas were off limits to the study. There is no explanation why.

**Recommendation: City staff determine what areas were not accessed and have the consultant add data from these areas as appropriate.**

**On page 18, the consultants seem to diminish the existence of two provincially rare floral species because they are presumed to be planted. Why does it make a difference that it is planted?**

8. Missing elements in the SLR:

Breeding Bird Inventory (page 5) - only done at three points over two year period (May 24, 2012, July 1 and 12, 2011). City Guideline for EIS and Status Land report (page 44) says at least 4 survey points. Also is it unclear whether one day at each time is sufficient is unclear. The timing of the surveys suggest an under reporting of confirmed breeders (only 2 found out of 49) as possibly probable breeders (18 found) as the CWS recommends that breeding bird surveys be done between May 24 to June 10<sup>th</sup>. Only one survey was done in this time period, and only on the very first available date (the other two were done in July). Given the number of species noted (49) in such a short time frame, it seems clear this is a significant breeding bird area (although the SLR does not provide comment on whether or not this is or is not a large number for London).

**Recommendation: Add fall migration survey**

9. Flora – page 16

The report notes that 70% of the 342 species of vascular plants documented are native. This compares to the 73% found by Kaiser in 1983. Given the increase in non-natives over the past 30 years, we suspect that 70% is an exceptionally good result.

**Recommendation: The report include a more recent comparator and city staff determine a more up to date comparator to be used and noted in future EIS and SLR work.**

10. Significant Steam Corridor

It is unclear if the corridor is 30 m on each side of the watercourse that has been determined to be significant.

**Recommendation: The significant stream corridor be identified on Schedule B-1 and be 30 m on each side.**

11. Maps:

Should show the topography

Official Plan designation

Ownership

Use of similar colours and shapes makes it difficult to read the otherwise helpful map on page 15

Proposed pathway (page 32) should be shown on a map

Electronic copies should be provided in future to make review and comment easier. If not in electronic form, at least larger than 8 1/2" x 11"