

| External Resource and First Nation Comments |                        |           |             |        |  | Consultant / City of London Response   |                       |                         |   |  |
|---|------------------------|-----------|-------------|--------|--|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Reviewer Affiliation                        | Reviewer (F. Lastname) | Comment # | EMG Section | Page # | Type of Comment<br>1 - Policy<br>2 - Format<br>3 -Science<br>4 - Process | Comment and Suggested Action   | Responder Affiliation | Responder (F. Lastname) | Response<br>1 - Incorporated<br>2 - Information Required<br>3 - Not Incorporated<br>4 - Not Applicable<br>5 - Forwarded to Consultant | Response Comment   |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 1         | ToR, 1.0    | 2      | 2  | Objective currently includes "identify data gaps". Greater specificity is needed here. Data gaps with regards to what? What is the "data"?   | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 4   | Data gaps consist of any background scientific or Traditional Knowledge data sources required to best implement the EMGs.  |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 2         | ToR, 2.0    | 2      | 2  | Language switches between "policy" and "policies". Should be made consistent.  | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 1   | Incorporated.  |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 3         | ToR, 3.1    | 2      | 1  | "where possible" This text should be removed. Current data and external sources should be updated absolutely.  | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 4   | Language not present in the ToR document or section 3.1. Unclear what EEPAC is referring to.   |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 4         | ToR 3.1     | 2      | 1  | Background and reference documents included should explicitly list peer-reviewed scientific studies, particularly those conducted in Southern Ontario  | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 1   | Background sources can include peer-reviewed scientific studies, however we don't want to limit the scope particularly as it relates to inclusive language around First Nations communities. Text identifies 'including, but not limited to' so that these documents can be considered.  |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 5         | ToR 3.1     | 3      | 3  | Add as reference document: Categorizing and Protecting Habitat under the Endangered Species Act, Feb 2012, Ontario   | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 1   | Incorporated.  |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 6         | ToR 3.1     | 3      | 3  | Add as reference document: Forest Edge Management Plan Guidelines, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, 2004   | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 1   | Incorporated.  |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 7         | ToR 3.1     | 3      | 3  | Add as reference document: Conservation Halton Ecological Monitoring Protocols, version 1.0, February 2017   | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 1   | Incorporated.  |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 8         | ToR 3.1     | 3      | 3  | Add as reference document: Ecological Buffer Guideline Review, Beacon Environmental for the Credit River Conservation Authority, Dec 2012  | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 1   | Incorporated.  |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 9         | Tor 3.1     | 3      | 1  | Other secondary source literature should include information relevant to strategies for mitigation, restoration and monitoring (both compliance and effectiveness monitoring)  | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 5   | Comment will be forwarded to the retained consultant.  |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 10        | ToR 3.1     | 4      | 3  | Background and reference documents should include examples of similar guidelines from other Ontario municipalities and Conservation Authorities  | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 1   | The ToR states that this list is not exhaustive, specifically 'not limited to'. Include as part of Phase 1 consultation.   |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 11        | Tor 3.1     | 4      | 1  | Insert text: "Additional references as may be provided by stakeholders throughout the process."  | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 3   | Additional references are more relevant during Phase 1 of the project, while the draft is being developed. Although references will be accepted throughout the process, in fairness to the consultant and other stakeholders and First Nation communities, those provided during Phase 2 may not be included as the consultant will not have sufficient time to evaluate and incorporate them into the final document. |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 12        | Tor 3.2     | 4      | 1  | Insert text: "For example, the CITY OF LONDON ESA EVALUATION CRITERIA APPLICATION GUIDELINES as they are part of the current Official Plan and the London Plan."   | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 4   | Unnecessary to explicitly state given that this is already included under the Official Plan and the London Plan.   |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 13        | ToR 3.2     | 5      | 4  | First nations to be included in consultation should be explicitly named. Insert text: "Chippewas of the Thames First Nation, Munsee-Delaware Nation, Oneida Nation of the Thames, Other First Nations groups as applicable." | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 4   | First Nation communities are included as part of the pre-consultation with the Nations explicitly named on pg. 4.  |

| External Resource and First Nation Comments |                        |           |             |        |  | Consultant / City of London Response  |                       |                         |   |  |
|---|------------------------|-----------|-------------|--------|--|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Reviewer Affiliation                        | Reviewer (F. Lastname) | Comment # | EMG Section | Page # | Type of Comment<br>1 - Policy<br>2 - Format<br>3 -Science<br>4 - Process | Comment and Suggested Action  | Responder Affiliation | Responder (F. Lastname) | Response<br>1 - Incorporated<br>2 - Information Required<br>3 - Not Incorporated<br>4 - Not Applicable<br>5 - Forwarded to Consultant | Response Comment   |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 14        | ToR 3.2     | 4      | 4  | This paragraph should be moved to Phase 1 (changing the timeline) because between now and the initial meeting is when comments on the 2007 documents will be received, not cutting off all stakeholders including EEPAC and First Nations at September 19th. "Comments on the existing EMGs document and how this policy tool can be improved or revised will be invited and gathered during this initial stage. Given the potential for a high volume of responses, an excel spreadsheet matrix will be circulated to organize comments. Responses will be completed in subsequent project phases. These initial comments will be considered in the revision of the Terms of Reference and circulated to the retained consultant during Phase 1 of the project." | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 1   | Incorporated.  |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 15        | ToR 3.2     | 4      | 4  | The consultant will be responsible for up to two meetings per external resource group or First Nation band during Phase 1 of the consultation process. The consultant will be responsible for meeting minutes <INSERT TEXT> "and for ensuring stakeholders are reminded of deadlines for submissions."  | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 3 and 1   | Have included that the consultant will be responsible for meeting minutes, but remaining aware of the project schedule and associated submissions will be the responsibility of the stakeholder groups. The draft EMG will be placed on EEPAC's agenda for comments as noted in the ToR.   |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 16        | ToR 3.1     | 4      | 1  | Include conclusions and recommendations of past subwatershed studies by the City of London  | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 5   | Subwatershed studies can be considered as part of the background information reviewed during draft development. Comment will be forwarded to the retained consultant.  |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 17        | ToR 3.2     | 5      | 4  | A second draft shall be prepared for external resource groups and First Nations review. All external resource groups and First Nations shall be invited to discuss areas of disagreement and attempt to resolve differences in a consultative manner  | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 3   | The process requires one round of consultation to identify issues and concerns to be completed during the updated draft production and provides circulation of comments on the draft proposed considering both the 2007 and newly drafted EMG. Based on these comments a final document would be produced. It would be unusual to provide an opportunity for comment and consultation on the final document prior to its consideration by PEC and not consistent with current practice. The final document will be brought to PEC where all public stakeholders and First Nations can comment. |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 18        | ToR 3.2     | 5      | 4  | Proposed modified timeline: Comments on existing 2007 EMG → Draft 1 → Comments on Draft 1 → Draft 2 → Comments on Draft 2 → Final Draft Presentation to EEPAC. This timeline should be made clear in a sequential chart.  | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 3   | The process requires one round of consultation to identify issues and concerns to be completed during the updated draft production and provides circulation of comments on the draft proposed considering both the 2007 and newly drafted EMG. Based on these comments a final document would be produced. It would be unusual to provide an opportunity for comment and consultation on the final document prior to its consideration by PEC and not consistent with current practice. The final document will be brought to PEC where all public stakeholders and First Nations can comment. |

| External Resource and First Nation Comments |                        |           |             |        |  | Consultant / City of London Response  |                       |                         |   |  |
|---|------------------------|-----------|-------------|--------|--|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Reviewer Affiliation                        | Reviewer (F. Lastname) | Comment # | EMG Section | Page # | Type of Comment<br>1 - Policy<br>2 - Format<br>3 -Science<br>4 - Process | Comment and Suggested Action  | Responder Affiliation | Responder (F. Lastname) | Response<br>1 - Incorporated<br>2 - Information Required<br>3 - Not Incorporated<br>4 - Not Applicable<br>5 - Forwarded to Consultant | Response Comment   |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 19        | ToR 3.3     | 5      | 4  | Insert Text: "The consultant should update only those sections of the Guidelines that need to be updated. However, a recommendation may be that some or all of the Guidelines not be revised. The consultant shall recommend how to update references in those Guidelines that require no changes, without opening said Guideline(s) to appeal to the LPAT" | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 3   | To be discussed with the retained consultant during Phase 1.   |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 20        | ToR 3.3     | 5      | 4  | New separate guideline for monitoring should be considered, reflecting pre- and post-construction period.   | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 5   | Comment will be forwarded to the retained consultant.  |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 21        | ToR 5.0     | 6      | 4  | Modified timeline for Phase 1: "April 16, 2020 – EEPAC presentation and circulation of the updated Draft EMGs for comment May 21, 2020 – Deadline to receive comments on the Draft EMGs from external resource groups and First Nations "   | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 4   | This represents the current proposed timeline - no change required.  |
| EEPAC                                       | Working Group          | 22        | ToR 5.0     | 6      | 4  | Modified timeline for Phase 2: Begin external resource group consultation on the Draft EMGs <INSERT TEXT> "(minimum two sessions per group)"  | City of London        | E. Williamson           | 3   | Not all groups may be interested in meeting twice to discuss the draft. The current proposed timeline stipulates between 0-48 meetings based on 12 stakeholder and First Nation communities. Additional meetings beyond this scope will be cost prohibitive for a retained consultant. |