

Comment/ Page Number	EEPAC Comment	Matrix Response
1. Highlight comment	Recommendation 1: EEPAC feels the Master Plan is incomplete without additional information on the area between the Dam study Area and the Forks Study Area. An EIS would provide additional helpful information for any future projects including the proposed new pathway and access points.	<p>Two additional reports were prepared to characterize the environmental conditions within the entire One River Master Plan Study Area, which includes the area between Springbank Dam and the Forks. The Reports are entitled “Natural Heritage Setting” which summaries the ecological components of the Study Area and the “River Characterization” report which provides more detail on the river’s hydraulics, hydrology and geomorphology. These additional reports are provided within the Master Plan.</p> <p>Any future projects recommended as part of the Master Plan component of One River would be required to meet the requirements of the selected EA schedule including the potential requirement for an EIS.</p>
2. Highlight comment	RECOMMENDATION 2: Even if an Overall Benefit Permit is not required, the City should demonstrate that this project provides an overall benefit, not just no net loss.	One objective of the Master Plan is to develop recommendations that provide an overall benefit to Thames River within the study area. The overall benefits are demonstrated through the evaluation process for each project in the Master Plan document, where the environmental aspects are integrated with both social and economic components.
3. Forks Comment	At EEPAC’s most recent meeting slides showed the impact of a much freer flowing river on the development of new sand bars etc. Will it also have an impact at the Forks?	Since the establishment of a free flowing river system, sand bars have developed and evolved at the Forks. The Forks of the Thames design is not, however, expected to interact with the riverine environment. Further detail on the morphology and evolution of the channel at the Forks is provided in the River Characterization report.
4. Forks Comment	RECOMMENDATION 4: EEPAC agrees with the recommendation for consultation and permitting discussions but would extend that discussion to include the locating of any access points and new pathways. It is unclear to EEPAC if the access points and additional pathway construction shown in the proposed preferred alternative are actually	Access points and additional pathways meet some of the objectives of the Master Plan to support the integration of the river’s social, recreational, and environmental roles. An alternative assessment, including an analysis of the environmental aspects/impacts of additional access points and pathways was completed through the evaluation process and

	necessary or would increase risk to sensitive species and their habitats as there is no information in this or the Dam EIS	described in the Master Plan document. Any future Schedule B project related to river access or pathways would be subject to additional analysis of risk and impacts to sensitive species habitat.
5. Forks Comment	RECOMMENDATION 5: The City address sanitary overflows at the Forks prior to completing any of the proposed projects in this location.	Sanitary sewer overflows have been considered in the Pollution Prevention and Control Plan. Mitigation of overflows has been included in the plan and is being implemented as part of the ongoing efforts by the City to improve water quality in the Thames River and provide a higher level of service for stormwater and sanitary sewer management.
6. Forks Comment	RECOMMENDATION 6: EEPAC would appreciate knowing how much funding will be provided to remove and remediate non-natives and invasives. Given the location in a highly urbanized setting, EEPAC asks the city to consider that the money would be better spent on invasive species management in ESAs and Significant Woodlands.	It is anticipated that future projects for implementing the recommendations of the Master Plan will be developed and funded to appropriate levels.
7. Forks Comment	Turtle overwintering studies- Should this be done? If so, when and by who?	No in-water construction works are anticipated to implement the Forks of the Thames preferred alternative. If in-water construction works are planned for the late fall or early spring, then an overwintering study is recommended. The need for an overwintering study will be assessed during detailed design and completed by an ecologist/biologist.
8. Forks Comment	Snake hibernacula studies- When would the studies be done and by who? It is possible the gabion baskets are hibernacula! The EIS on page iv indicated that the gabion baskets would be removed.	Although gabion baskets are not a typical choice for snake hibernacula there are studies which have identified that in areas where “natural” hibernacula is scarce that snakes will use gabion baskets. The need for emergence surveys will be determined during detailed design and conducted by an ecologist/biologist.
9. Forks Comment	RECOMMENDATION 7: Consultation prior to detail design be carried out with the Species at Risk Ecologist at the UTRCA who specializes in turtle and snake species at risk	Agreed, consultation with appropriate UTRCA staff during detailed design would be an essential part of design development.
10. Forks Comment	It does not appear to be any assessment of the mussel / fish relationship given that mussels rely on certain fish species to carry their eggs/larvae.	The SAR and SCC Appendices identify host fish species for each mussel species. The presence of these fish species was used to identify potential presence within the Thames River.

11. Forks Comment	An Overall Benefit Permit be obtained for these projects. If not required, the projects should demonstrate an overall benefit.	The objective of the Master Plan is to develop recommendations that provide an overall benefit to Thames River within the study area. The overall benefits are demonstrated through the evaluation process for each project in the Master Plan document, where the environmental aspects are integrated with both social and economic components. During the detailed design, required permits (including the need for the Overall Benefit Permit) will be identified.
12. Forks/Dam Comment	RECOMMENDATION 9: The EIS clarify the category of tolerance for this species at risk (Silver Shiner)	Categories will be confirmed during detailed design.
13. Forks Comment	RECOMMENDATION 10: Greater detail as to what “correct mitigation measures” be included in the EIS prior to it being finalized. This information should be included in the EIS so that it does not get lost between now and detailed design.	The “correct mitigation measures” are those identified within Section 7. This sentence will be adjusted in the EIS to be more clear.
14. Forks Comment	Re SHTM1-2 - why Manitoba Maple, a non-native species would be protected? There is also common buckthorn in the understory (p.29). Also Norway Maple is an invasive species. p. iv states that “non-native and invasive species will be removed as part of the <i>London Invasive Plant Management Strategy</i> and replaced with native trees and shrub plantings throughout the park as part of the softscape design.” The question is to what extent? What about the invasives in SHTM1-1?	Part of the Forks of the Thames design intent is to limit disturbance along the riparian corridor and avoid removing existing vegetation, particularly tree removals. Although some species within polygon SHTM1-2 are non-native, there is still value in their size and ability to provide bank stabilization, carbon storage and wildlife habitat. SHTM1-1 is not located within the footprint for the proposed Forks of the Thames design. The extent of invasive species management outside of the Forks of the Thames design footprint will be based on the projects implemented as part of the Master Plan.
15. Forks Comment	Who prepares the monitoring plan and when? Who cares it out? EEPAC questions when the invasive species management plan would be drafted and by who.	The Schedule B requirements normally include a monitoring plan which includes an invasive species management component. The plan would be drafted by the City or by the design consultant, in conjunction with the City, during the detailed design stage.
16. Forks Comment	RECOMMENDATION 11: EEPAC requests to be involved in the discussions leading up to the preparation of the Invasive	The City will engage EEPAC as part of the detailed design stage.

	Species Management Plan. It is our preference that all non-native and invasive be removed	
17. Forks Comment	RECOMMENDATION 12: EEPAC's preference is that the Invasive Species Management Plan be drafted by Matrix now given it has done the field work with the plan and that the plan be included as a requirement for the winning bidder to implement. Money must be included in the contract budget for monitoring, and monitoring shall be carried out by an ecologist hired by the contractor to the satisfaction of the City and the UTRCA.	A recommendation for the monitoring plan is included in the Mater Plan. Details of that plan are best developed during the development of the detailed design as various aspects of design and construction are confirmed.
18. Forks Comment	p. 54 indicates increased pedestrian activity and that it should be directed to the south. It is unclear how this is possible when there are pathways along the east heading north and along the Dyke. Therefore, it is unclear what areas are to be avoided and what access to the River in addition to the existing fishing dock is proposed and why	The Forks of the Thames design is still preliminary. The EIS suggests that no direct access to the river be placed along the north side, which could potentially connect people to sandbars around the Kensington bridge piers. Additional detail in regard to access and limits to access will be part of the next stage of design.
19. Forks Comment	RECOMMENDATION 13: A clear monitoring plan be developed including who does, when it begins and ends, and its objectives. This could be shown on a timeline scale given the start date is unknown.	A recommendation for the monitoring plan is included in the Mater Plan. Details of that plan are best developed during the development of the detailed design as various aspects of design and construction are confirmed.
20. Forks Comment	RECOMMENDATION 14: Before construction, information on species at risk identification including photos posted in construction trailer during construction. Ideally, this will reduce or avoid mortality	This recommendation will be considered during detailed design.
21. Forks Comment	RECOMMENDATION 15: The phone number of the Species at Risk Biologist from UTRCA be posted prominently so that turtle and snake sightings can be reported. When sightings occur, work must cease until the species at risk biologist has given the go ahead for work to start up again.	This recommendation will be considered during detailed design.
22.	p. 11 wording of the second paragraph is unclear "... with the Technical advisory included ... (?)	Agreed, this is unclear, the statement will be revised in the report.
23. Forks Comment	P. 14 vegetation surveys were done too late for any spring ephemerals. No clear explanation of why surveys were not done earlier.	The Terms of Reference (TOR) for this effort was not approved until later in the Spring. The report will be revised to reflect this comment.

24. Forks Comment	No surveys of amphibians. No clear explanation of why not done.	No wetlands or vernal pools are located in the study area, which would limit the presence of amphibians. The need for amphibian surveys were discussed during the EIS scoping meetings and not included in the TOR.
25. Springbank Dam Comments	It is not accurate to say the Terms of Reference were approved by EEPAC. We have no approval authority. It would be more accurate to say EEPAC participated in the review of the Terms of Reference that were approved by the City. I would also suggest the same is true of the UTRCA "approval." Again, I don't believe the city EIS requirements require approval by the UTRCA.	Agreed, these statements will be revised in the EIS reports.
26. Springbank Dam Comments	RECOMMENDATION 2: Additional benthic sampling be done before the EIS is accepted. Alternatively, if there is existing sampling data that would be representative, it can be used instead of additional sampling.	Historical benthic sampling has been completed throughout the Study area reaches and a program for further studies still exists. Additional benthic sampling was not included in the TOR. Benthic conditions are further described in the Natural Heritage Setting report.
27. Springbank Dam Comments	p. 32, notes 7 large Norway maples. RECOMMENDATION 3: These should be removed as part of any invasive species management plan for the study area.	This recommendation will be considered during detailed design.
28. Springbank Dam Comments	A number of SAR fish, mussels, and herps including Spiny Softshell. Any work be done under an Overall Benefit permit	Consultation with MNRF during the detailed design will identify the need for permitting.
29. Springbank Dam Comments	One SWH (turtle overwintering habitat) types is located within the Project Site. The question is where will this be captured in a to-do list for the decommissioning project? It is not noted in section 7.2 Mitigation Measures on page 53. It is not clear what the implications are for the proposed project if the pool is being used for overwintering. RECOMMENDATION 5: Surveys be completed prior to awarding a bid in order to determine if there are species and overwintering habitat within the pool.	It has been recommended that any in-water construction work required for the Springbank Dam Decommissioning be completed outside the overwintering period (October to April). If work cannot be completed during this period an overwintering study is recommended. The need for an overwintering study will be assessed during detailed design and will, if required, be completed by an ecologist/biologist.

30. Springbank Dam Comments	p. 44-45 discusses the 3 categories of general habitat protection Threatened and Endangered fish species like the Silver Shiner receive. However, there is no mention of the category in which the study area is in	Categories will be confirmed during detailed design when more information on the design elements is better understood.
31. Springbank Dam Comments	The Erosion Sediment Control Plan's major objectives and major issues needs to be incorporated in this EIS.	A formal Erosion and Sediment Control plan (ESC) plan that identifies issues and objectives will be completed during detailed design when more information on the design elements is better understood.
32. Springbank Dam Comments	RECOMMENDATION 7: The proposed dewatering procedure needs to identify in more detail what would be incorporated in the proposed protective measures to minimize the estimated potential adverse impacts, the estimated time periods that the existing environmental/ecological system may be effected from these impacts and a list of specific mitigation measures are required to be identified in EIS.	Further details on the dewatering procedures and mitigation measures will be completed during detailed design when project phasing and ESC plans are developed.
33. Springbank Dam Comments	RECOMMENDATION 8: Before construction, information on species at risk identification including photos posted in construction trailer during construction. Ideally, this will reduce or avoid mortality	This recommendation will be considered during detailed design.
34. Springbank Dam Comments	RECOMMENDATION 9: The phone number of the Species at Risk Biologist from UTRCA be posted prominently so that turtle and snake sightings can be reported. When sightings occur, work must cease until the species at risk biologist has given the go ahead for work to start up again.	This recommendation will be considered during detailed design.
35. Springbank Dam Comments	p. 55 (re 4D) – Invasive Species Management Plan) EEPAC questions when the invasive species management plan would be drafted and by who. RECOMMENDATION 10: Our preference is that it be drafted by Matrix now given it has done the field work with the plan included as a requirement for the winning bidder to implement. Money must be included in the contract budget for monitoring, and monitoring shall be carried out by an ecologist hired by the contractor to the satisfaction of the City and the UTRCA.	The Schedule B requirements normally include a monitoring plan which includes an invasive species management component. The plan would be drafted by the City or by the design consultant, in conjunction with the City, during the detailed design stage.

36. Springbank Dam Comments	<p>p. 56 states no long term impacts are anticipated. The ultimate question is what would long term impacts be? Loss of species? Over what period of time? And how would changes be definitively linked to the project impacts?</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 11: The EIS should include what long term impacts might be so that any compensatory mitigation measures could be implemented at a future date and charged back to the project.</p>	No long-term negative impacts are anticipated. The preferred alternative for Springbank Dam is to remove in-water barriers and re-vegetate/naturalize the river banks, which would further improve river health, habitat, and natural function over the long term.
37. Springbank Dam Comments	<p>page 57 indicates there should be additional consultation with UTRCA to identify any additional studies needed for this project. It is unclear at what stage these consultations would take place and what sort of information the consultants feel is required.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 12: The noted additional consultation with the UTRCA take place prior to finalizing the EIS.</p>	Additional consultation with UTRCA will take place during detailed design when design elements are being finalized and construction timing and phasing of the project are determined. The City has consulted with the UTRCA several times during this project. Further consultation with UTRCA has been recommended as the project progresses to ensure that any changes in species at risk habitats are captured and correctly mitigated during construction.
38. Springbank Dam Comments	<p>To authorize and issues various permits for the City to undertake the recommended work, MNRF and DFO, generally require that the Consultant together with City staff will develop and provide some type of Mitigation and Compensation Plans associated with the proposed work to ensure all required protection of various habitats and existing ecological/environmental conditions in accordance with the applicable Federal and Provincial Acts.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION 13: The major issues; measures and the considered locations for the Mitigation and Compensation Plans needs to include in this EIS.</p>	Consultation with federal and provincial agencies to develop a Mitigation and Compensation plan will occur during detailed design when more information on the design elements is better understood.
39. Springbank Dam Comments	<p>RECOMMENDATION 14: In order to ensure that all proposed work and mitigation/compensation/restoration work is working, in addition to all recommended monitoring, EEPAC recommends that the post-construction monitoring also include Benthic and Basic Chemistry Water Quality Monitoring at the minimum 3 locations - upstream,</p>	This recommendation will be considered during detailed design

	immediately downstream of these works and further at the location app.100 m downstream of the proposed work.	
40. Springbank Dam Comments	EEPAC is concerned about the additional access points and pathways on the north side of the River south of Riverside Drive and west along the River. Without any supporting EIS work, we cannot support the proposed alternative 3 at this time. We look forward to reviewing the studies that concluded such works would have no negative impacts on the natural heritage system or species at risk and their habitat.	Any future projects recommended as part of the Master Plan would meet the requirements of the selected schedule including the requirement for an EIS. The alternatives evaluation process for the Mater Plan includes discussion on the positive and negative aspects of the recommendations.
41. Springbank Dam Comments	Swifts may well have been occupying the chimney that burned down, but, if they were, they would drop in directly and not perch on top of the chimney. Swift use of a chimney is usually confirmed by observation of an actual entry into or exit from the chimney. When swifts first return in the spring, the airspace above the river corridor along Springbank Park is particularly significant as a foraging area. In considering impacts on swifts of activities within the Study Area, it is important to include impacts to the habitat that produces the food on which swifts forage.	Agreed, information about Swifts occupying the house will be removed from the report. Information about the Swifts will only reference foraging.
42. Springbank Dam Comments	p. 48 layout of impacts. EEPAC would like to see this as a requirement for assessment of impacts for ALL projects (add to update of EMG) expressed as a matrix for each impact and its type (4 x 3 matrix) Both direct and indirect impacts on natural heritage features and functions can occur as a result of the preferred alternative. Impacts and residual effects on natural heritage features were assessed based on the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Duration - long or short-term</li> <li>• Extent - localized or expansive</li> <li>• Permanent - permanent or temporary</li> <li>• Severity - positive or negative</li> </ul>	No response required.



