



EEPAC Consultation Meeting Summary

Meeting name
EMG Phase 1
Consultation –
EEPAC Meeting #1

Meeting date
January 6, 2020

Time
12:00PM – 2:00PM

Attendees
Brendon Samuels (EEPAC);
Rebecca Doyle (EEPAC);
Sandy Levin (EEPAC);
Carol Dyck (EEPAC);
Suba Sivakumar (EEPAC);
Shelby Paxton (TREA);
Diane Szoller (ACE/TREA);
Sean Hudson (City of London);
Alicia Evans (AECOM);
Shari Muscat (AECOM);
Nathan DeCarlo (AECOM).

Project name
Consultation and
Preparation of the
Environmental
Management
Guidelines (2007)
Update

Location
2nd Floor Meeting Room, 32
Wellington Drive (Advanced
Facility for Avian Research),
London, Ontario,
N6G 4W4

Theme 1: Ecological Monitoring

What is most important?

- Establishing baseline data
- Loss of biodiversity
- Clear identification of roles and responsibilities in ecological monitoring
- Incorporation of a landscape approach
 - Resources from adjacent projects, studies, etc.
- Understanding ecological function versus species composition or habitat
- Utilize up-to-date science
- Standardized and current methodology
- Data control and feedback from monitoring
- Inclusion of social and First Nation consultation in pre-construction phases

How can we make this tangible?

- Increased monitoring frequency
 - 5-season versus 3-season
 - Winter monitoring (i.e., raptors)
- Identifying key resources
 - i.e., experts, funding, technology, studies/reports, etc.
- Integrate citizen science or institutional (i.e., universities) data
 - Appeal to landowners (i.e., door-to-door) for Permission-to-Enter
 - Determine whether citizen data can be incorporated into EISs (i.e., sliding scale of confidence, 3-step verification – iNaturalist, experts versus novice)
- Utilize other municipal resources (i.e., Region of Waterloo, City of Guelph)
- Incorporate language that is clear and is easily updated with changing science

What other information or resources are required?

- Online repository of standardized and approved methodologies
- More frequent review or updates to the Environmental Management Guidelines to ensure science and methodology is up-to-date

- Contact list of experts for consultation, etc.
- Sharing of data among organizations to provide a better picture
 - Inconsistency between adjacent/overlapping projects

Other comments?

- Encouraging landowners for PTE
 - Use personal contact rather than mailing for a greater likelihood of participation
 - Potentially include financial incentives for allowing ecological monitoring on properties

Theme 2: Buffers

What is most important?

- Up-to-date science and the use of more recent available literature (i.e., Beacon 2012 – 3 stage approach)
- Defining and understanding buffers versus setbacks versus critical function zones
- What is the purpose of the buffer and what is being buffered against?
- Encroachment into buffers
- Cumulative impacts
- Determining appropriate and scientifically defensible buffer width
- No one-size-fits-all for buffer width – the standard buffer width is not always appropriate

How can we make this tangible?

- Utilize a reductive buffer approach
- Implement increased protection of buffer function
- Outline understanding that as buffers decreases, the probability of protecting the feature decreases
- Keep it concise and simple to understand, with clear guidelines on buffer width
- Clearly define buffers
- Define and protect the ecological function of a feature using current policies and science

What other information or resources are required?

- Who will deal with encroachment monitoring and enforcement?
- Explore if other municipalities have had to defend buffer guidelines/policies
- Understanding how much habitat is enough?
- Explore the different buffer definition methodologies (i.e., current, reductive, beacon)
- Ensure scientific defensibility to buffer widths/guidelines

Other comments?

- Pathways versus trails and the potential implications for buffers

Theme #3: Climate Change

What is most important?

- Invasive species range and colonization
- Temporal/longitudinal changes in weather/temperature
- Frequency and severity of weather events
- Capturing shifting baselines
- Spread/expanding range of species disease
- Restoration, mitigation, and compensation in the context of climate adaptation

- Increased frequency or updates to the Environmental Management Guidelines as the science/climate changes
- Impacts of climate change on microclimate
- Loss of tree species/individuals

How can we make this tangible?

- Shift the Environmental Management Guidelines document to a living document or decrease the time period between reviews
- Integrate and collaborate in stormwater and watershed management
- Refer to other studies/reports in a comparable geographic area (i.e., southern Ontario) on the impacts of climate change on the Natural Heritage System
- Integrate climate change considerations into EISs and ensure that the considerations are clear and easily interpreted
- Refer to other resources for information on climate adaptation in natural heritage (i.e., planting lists, BMPs, City of Chicago document).
- Implementing climate mitigation and adaptation through a stand-alone ecological restoration/compensation chapter and create feasible timelines/monitoring

What other information or resources are required?

- Scientific resources (i.e., journal articles, long-term studies), websites, and other studies/reports to ensure climate considerations and implementation of ecological restoration in scientifically sound and up-to-date
 - Climate change adaptation and mitigation and the natural environment/ecological function (specifically within the municipal context)
 - Integrating climate change into ecological restoration and compensation for habitat

Other comments?

- N/A

Theme #4: Compliance and Effectiveness Monitoring

What is most important?

- Definition of specific requirements around compliance and effectiveness monitoring
- Outlining the consequences for not meeting targets
- Ensuring the monitoring program is related to protecting natural features and their functions
- Determine the appropriate monitoring length post-construction (standard vs. dynamic timeframes)
- Understanding the implications of multi-phase development on the post-construction monitoring
- Defining the roles and responsibilities for the monitoring program
- Transparency in the process of mitigating conflicts of interest
- Contingency mechanisms should be in place to protect natural features and their functions
- Integrate citizen science/involvement in the monitoring
 - Include residents in monitoring to improve community engagement

How can we make this tangible?

- Define and follow the post-construction monitoring plan from the beginning (including multi-phase development)
- Define and ensure justification for post-construction monitoring and the associated timeframes

- Shift monitoring to an iterative process
- Include information/recommendations for the monitoring program within the EIS
- Outline clear consequences for non-compliances
 - Development fees versus City of London budget
- Outline that restoration is not synonymous with monitoring
 - Restoration versus ecological function

What other information or resources are required?

- Other municipality policies and guidelines that have been effective or defensible

Other comments?

- N/A