

Environmental Impact Statement

*8520 McArton Road
PT LT CON 12, GOULBOURN TOWNSHIP*

November 2020

Prepared for:

Ottawa Valley Wild Bird Care Centre

Prepared by:

Holly Bickerton, BAsC, MES

Consulting Ecologist

143 Aylmer Ave

Ottawa, ON K1S 2Y1

Phone: (613) 730-7725

Email: holly.bickerton@rogers.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1.0 INTRODUCTION | 2 |
| 1.1 PROPERTY LOCATION..... | 2 |
| <hr/> | |
| 2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION: NATURAL ENVIRONMENT..... | 4 |
| 2.1 EXISTING LAND USE..... | 4 |
| 2.2 SITE DESIGNATIONS | 4 |
| 2.3 LANDFORMS, SOIL AND GEOLOGY..... | 5 |
| 2.4 SURFACE WATER, GROUNDWATER AND FISH HABITAT | 6 |
| 2.5 VEGETATION..... | 6 |
| 2.6 WILDLIFE 8 | |
| 2.7 SPECIES AT RISK..... | 8 |
| 2.8 SIGNIFICANT WOODLANDS..... | 10 |
| 2.9 CORRIDORS AND LINKAGES | 11 |
| <hr/> | |
| 3.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT | 12 |
| <hr/> | |
| 4.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION | 14 |
| 4.1 WETLANDS AND GROUNDWATER | 14 |
| 4.2 SPECIES AT RISK AND THEIR HABITAT | 14 |
| <hr/> | |
| 5.0 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 15 |
| <hr/> | |
| 6.0 REFERENCES | 17 |
| <hr/> | |
| 7.0 LIMITATIONS | 18 |

Figures

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| Figure 1 | City of Ottawa Official Plan, Schedule A, Rural Policy Plan. | 2 |
| Figure 2 | 8520 McArton Road (red star) showing PSW complex | 4 |
| Figure 3 | PSW (filled blue), unevaluated wetland (open blue) and Significant Woodland (dark green) on and near subject property.. | 5 |
| Figure 4 | Vegetation Communities (yellow) on and near 8520 McArton Road.. | 7 |
| Figure 5 | Area where foraging Eastern Meadowlarks observed at 8520 McArton Road..... | 10 |
| Figure 6 | 8570 McArton Road (red star) shown within the regional context t..... | 11 |
| Figure 7 | Proposed Site Plan, 8520 McArton Road..... | 13 |

Appendices

| | | |
|------------|---|----|
| Appendix 1 | Photos of ELC Vegetation Communities, 8520 McArton Road | 19 |
| Appendix 2 | Bird Observations on and near 8520 McArton Road, 2015-2019..... | 22 |
| Appendix 3 | Information Gathering Form – submitted to MECP | 23 |

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Property Location

The property is located approximately 40 kilometres southwest of downtown Ottawa within the City of Ottawa. The legal description is as follows: PT LT 4 CON 12 GEOGRAPHIC TOWNSHIP OF GOULBOURN, BEING PART 1 ON, PLAN 4R-31570. It is Part 1 of PIN04444-0010 LT.

The property is designated General Rural on Ottawa's Official Plan. Zoning is RU (Figure 1).




Figure 1 City of Ottawa Official Plan, Schedule A, Rural Policy Plan. Property boundary is within red circle. Light orange colour represents General Rural designation, blue is Significant Wetland.

Methodology

For the purpose of this EIS and to satisfy conditions of a development agreement, surveys were carried out on the property on the dates below. Grassland bird surveys were carried out according to the MNRF protocol (2011) on the subject property. Five point count locations were established and completed on each visit, following guidelines in the MNRF protocol.

Table 1 Fieldwork in 2019 on subject property.

| Date | Time | Personnel Involved | Weather Conditions | Purpose of Visit |
|--------------|------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 27 May 2019 | 7:30am-9am | Holly Bickerton | Sunny, light wind, ~20C | Grassland birds, wildlife vegetation |
| 3 June 2019 | 7:30am-9am | Holly Bickerton | Mix of sun/cloud, moderate wind, ~10C | Grassland birds, wildlife, vegetation |
| 10 June 2019 | 7:30am-9am | Holly Bickerton | Cloudy, light wind, ~20C | Grassland birds, wildlife vegetation |

Prior to the severance of this property, field surveys were also completed by H. Bickerton on following dates: 23 Sept 2015, 6 October 2016, 22 June 2018 and 4 July 2018. Further details are presented in Bickerton 2018. Note that these surveys included a broader area than the current study area, and a focus was on wetland boundaries.

Desktop surveys provided background information on natural heritage features in proximity to the subject property as well as a listing of SAR and their habitat potentially present in proximity to the subject property:

- Data from NHIC database was accessed via Land Information Ontario (LIO) Make a Natural Heritage Map (http://www.gisapplication.lrc.gov.on.ca/mamnh/Index.html?site=MNR_NHLUPS_NaturalHeritage&viewer=NaturalHeritage&locale=en-US) for grid square 18VR1706 in which the property is located.
- Data from the Ontario Nature Reptiles and Amphibians of Ontario Atlas was accessed via http://www.ontarionature.org/protect/species/reptiles_and_amphibians/index.php (Ontario Nature 2019). Location information was obtained from the range maps provided on the website for SAR reptiles.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION: NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

2.1 Existing Land Use

The 17.3 acre (7.0 ha) property purchased by the Wild Bird Care Centre was severed from a larger lot at 8574 McArton Road in 2018. The parcel at 8520 McArton Road consists mainly of a hayfield. An unevaluated wetland is also found on the northeast boundary of the property. Until the time of severance, the hayfield in the centre of the proposed severance was grazed by cattle from a neighbouring farm. The hayfield is fenced. Across McArton Road to the north is a cattle farm.

2.2 Site Designations

The subject property is surrounded on three sides by the Manions Corners (Long Swamp) Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) Complex (Figure 2). Immediately adjacent to the PSW to the east of the property is an unevaluated wetland identified by MNRF (Figure 3).




Figure 2 8520 McArton Road (red star) showing PSW complex surrounding the site to the east, south and west. Mapping from GeoOttawa, 5 June 2019.



Figure 3 PSW (filled blue), unevaluated wetland (open blue) and Significant Woodland (dark green) on and near subject property. Mapping obtained from MNR (LIO) Make A Natural Heritage Map (provincial layers) on 5 June 2019.

The MNR has mapped the wooded areas along the property boundary as Significant Woodlands (see Figure 3, dark green). This is primarily because the woodlands are contiguous with a large natural area to the south and east. This will be discussed below.

There are no significant valleylands, ANSIs, or other significant natural features on or adjacent to the property.

2.3 Landforms, Soil and Geology

The area proposed for severance is flat tableland. The Ontario Geological Survey data identifies that the surficial geology of the area proposed to be severed consists mostly of glacial till (sandy silt to silty sand) of unspecified depth. Recent geotechnical assessment confirmed that the soils in an area of investigation on the northern portion of the property are shallow, ie. 2-3 feet over bedrock.

Bedrock in the area consists of sedimentary limestone, dolostone, shale and/or sandstone of the Ottawa Group (Ontario Geology Survey 2015; see Geofirma Engineering 2018). Where surface depressions exist in bedrock, the area is poorly drained and surficial mineral and organic deposits have developed in the wetland areas.

2.4 Surface Water, Groundwater and Fish Habitat

The subject property is within the Jock River watershed which is governed by the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA 2019). There is an unevaluated wetland containing permanent standing water to the east of the property, and surface drainage to the south and west of the property (Figure 3).

No creeks, drains, or other surface water was observed on the property during any site visits in (2015-2019).

The average depth to the aquifer in the area has been identified from water well data as 30.5 m (range 19.8 to 42.7, Geofirma Engineering 2018). Hydrogeological work also determined that the likely direction of shallow groundwater flow is east toward the Provincially Significant Wetland (see 2.4.3., Groundwater Flow Direction p. 3). The shallow depth of soil (<2m) in this area also suggests that the bedrock aquifer is potentially vulnerable to impacts in this area (e.g. chemical inputs, septic beds).

No fish or fish habitat was observed during any site visits.

2.5 Vegetation

The subject property is located in the St. Lawrence Lowlands Ecoregion, in the Mixedwood Plains Ecozone. Vegetation surveys were completed on 10 June 2019 and also in 2015 and 2016 as outlined in Bickerton 2018.

Vegetation communities have been identified approximately following the Ecological Land Classification method (Lee et al. 1998, Figure 4). Note that vegetation classification was completed in 2015 but is unchanged in 2019 based on recent field visits. All of the vegetation communities are common in Ontario, with no rare vegetation communities or their features identified. Photographs of all communities are found in Appendix 1.




Figure 4 Vegetation Communities (yellow) on and near 8520 McArton Road. Blue line represents approximate property boundary. Please disregard red line.

Cultural Meadow (CUM1): The cultural meadow is dominated by forbs such as Red Clover (*Trifolium pretense*), Black Medick (*Medicago lupulina*), Bird's-foot Trefoil (*Lotus corniculatus*), Daisy Fleabane (*Erigeron annuus*), Wild Strawberry (*Fragaria virginiana*), Common Milkweed (*Asclepias syriaca*) and Queen Anne's Lace (*Daucus carota*) as well as forage grasses such as Smooth Brome (*Bromus inermis*), Orchard Grass (*Dactylis glomerata*) and Timothy (*Phleum pratense*).

Willow Thicket Swamp (SWT): This community on the eastern edge of the proposed lot was probably formerly pastured and has reverted to native vegetation. It is now dominated by Willows (*Salix bebbiana*, *S. discolor*, *S. petiolaris*) and other shrubs, including Red-osier Dogwood (*Cornus stolonifera*) and Glossy Buckthorn (*Rhamnus frangula*). The understory is dominated by a mixture of facultative and wetland species (e.g. Blackish Bulrush (*Scirpus atrovirens*), Field Horsetail (*Equisetum arvense*). This wetland community is somewhat degraded due to its past land use, but is contiguous with the larger provincially significant wetland complex (Manion's Corners/Long Swamp) to its east and the boundary appears to generally concur with an OMNRF wetland boundary provided by the RVCA (ie. not the zoned PSW). No significant features were observed in the area investigated. Its main ecological value is to provide a vegetated buffer to the adjacent PSW.

Fresh-Moist Eastern White Cedar Coniferous Forest (FOC): This moist forest is dominated by Eastern White Cedar (*Thuja occidentalis*). The understory is very sparse due to low light

conditions. The species present are predominantly facultative species, and are not considered wetland indicators (e.g. Lady Fern (*Athyrium felix-femina*), Peduncled Sedge (*Carex pedunculata*), Helleborine (*Epipactis helleborine*), Solomon's Seal (*Maianthemum pubescens*), Sarsaparilla (*Aralia nudicaulis*).

Cultural Thicket and Woodland (CUT, CUW): There are patches of shrub-dominated thicket and woodland that are likely regenerating from past agricultural use, and are dominated by a mixture of native and non-native species. Woodlands are dominated by pioneer species such as Trembling Aspen, Balsam Poplar, Bur Oak, White Pine, and American Elm.

Deciduous Swamp (SWD): The mineral deciduous swamp found to the southeast of the property line is dominated by scattered American Elm (*Ulmus americana*) and some Bur Oak (*Quercus macrocarpa*). The understory contains wetland species including a number of wetland sedges, and non-native species including Reed Canary-grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*) and Glossy Buckthorn.

2.6 Wildlife

Wildlife species observed on the site were identified by sight and other direct evidence (song, call, tracks, scat).

Mammals identified on the site included White-tailed Deer (2019), Red Squirrel (2015), Groundhog (2015), and Eastern Cottontail (2015).

No reptiles or amphibians were identified on the site during any field investigations.

Eleven species of birds have been identified directly using the subject property; however, 18 additional species were identified nearby or flying over the property during at least five site visits (Table Appendix 2). Of these, Eastern Meadowlark is considered most significant, in that it is a Species at Risk and is listed as Threatened in Ontario and Canada (see below). All other birds observed are common in the Ottawa area and provincially. No area-sensitive bird species were observed on the property.

No other significant wildlife was observed on the property. There was no Significant Wildlife Habitat identified on the property according to definitions within the Natural Heritage Reference Manual (2010).

2.7 Species at Risk

Desktop survey results for Species at Risk (SAR) observations in the area included the NHIC grid square (NHIC 2019), the Ontario Nature Reptile and Amphibians database (2019), the Ontario Breeding Bird Atlas (2008) and eBird (2019). These searches suggested that the following species had the potential to be present in the general area: Butternut (*Juglans cinerea*), Barn

Swallow (*Hirundo rustica*), Chimney Swift (*Chaetura pelagica*), Eastern Meadowlark (*Sturnella magna*), Bobolink (*Dolichonyx oryzivorus*), Blanding's Turtle (*Emydoidea blandingii*) and Snapping Turtle (*Chelydra serpentina*).

Field surveys completed in 2015 and 2016 for a scoped EIS prior to the property severance (2018) provided information on Species at Risk. No Butternut trees were observed, and there were no structures within the proposed area that could provide suitable nesting habitat for Barn Swallow or Chimney Swifts. No turtle habitat is present in the old field, which is entirely terrestrial and has no loose soil or other substrate suitable for nesting. MECP concurred in the IGF the site does not contain Blanding's Turtle habitat (C. Hann, pers.comm. 2019). Due to roadkill observations in the area, MECP suggested construction mitigations to prevent site nesting, which have been incorporated into this report.

During field investigations in September 2015 prior to the property severance, two Eastern Meadowlarks were observed. The late date of the survey suggested that these Meadowlarks may be migratory. Because the Cultural Meadow, an old hayfield, is considered suitable habitat for both Eastern Meadowlark and Bobolink, a requirement for surveys following the Ontario protocol was identified as part of the development agreement governing the severance.

Three surveys were completed following Ministry protocol (OMNR 2011) in May and June 2019. On 27 May, two Eastern Meadowlark were observed on the property for a few minutes, in the vicinity shown in Figure 5. On 3 June, no Eastern Meadowlark were observed on the property but individuals were singing heard to the north, across McArton Road. On 10 June, two Eastern Meadowlarks were observed as they flew toward the centre of the property where they foraged for a few minutes, then returned. One of these individuals was also frequently observed singing from trees surrounding the hayfield to the north and west.

An Information Gathering Form (IGF) was submitted to MECP on 6 May 2019 to identify potential SAR habitat on the property and to identify the scope of study planned (Appendix 3). Comments received on 28 June 2019 requested additional detail regarding the surveys. A telephone discussion with Management Biologist Carolyn Hann at MECP (28 June 2019) confirmed that surveys were sufficient for MECP's requirements, and that the footprint of the building would be considered to fall within Category 3 habitat. See more detail in Impacts and Mitigation, below.

In summary, observations of Eastern Meadowlark on three of four visits suggest that they are using the property for foraging. Based on field observations, Eastern Meadowlark are thought to be nesting on the cattle farm across McArton Road to the north, which contains a large area of suitable habitat. There is no evidence that Eastern Meadowlark are nesting on the subject property.



Figure 5 Area where foraging Eastern Meadowlarks were observed, May-June 2019.

A single Monarch (SC) was observed on 23 Sept 2015 in the Cultural Meadow, which contains several forb species suitable for breeding and feeding Monarch. The habitat of Special Concern species is considered Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) under the Natural Heritage Reference Manual (OMNR 2010).

Bobolink were not observed at any time in the hayfield, despite the presence of suitable habitat. No Butternut were found on the property.

No other SAR or their habitat were observed on the property during any visits. There were no observations of Barn Swallow (*Hirundo rustica*) or Chimney Swift (*Chaetura pelagica*) and there are no structures to provide nesting or roosting habitat. Although the PSW may provide habitat for both Blanding's Turtle (*Emydoidea blandingii*) and Snapping Turtle (*Chelydra serpentina*), none were observed. The Cultural Meadow is entirely vegetated with no open or loose substrate that could be considered suitable for nesting.

2.8 Significant Woodlands

As shown in Figure 3, the MNRF has identified woodlands on the property margin as Significant Woodlands. However, the woodland does not meet the City of Ottawa's criteria for Significant Woodlands (2018) based upon the Natural Heritage Reference Manual (OMNR 2010). The

property is found in the Ottawa West planning area with forest cover of 38.4%. The woodland does not meet thresholds for size and ecological function. It also has no uncommon characteristics: it is estimated to be less than 80 years in age, and contains no provincially significant vegetation communities or rare species. It is on private property with no known economic or social value.

2.9 Corridors and Linkages

The unevaluated wetland to the east of the developable area (Figure 3) is contiguous with the PSW and provides a habitat linkage for wetland wildlife to the Manion's Corners PSW, which extends several kilometres to the northwest and south (Figure 6).

Woodlands and forests on the property, while not significant according to the City or PPS definitions (City of Ottawa 2018), provide a margin of contiguous wooded habitat to buffer and support the Manion's Corners PSW.



Figure 6 8570 McArton Road (red star) shown within the regional context together with natural heritage linkages including PSWs (dark blue), unevaluated wetlands (open blue) and Woodlands (dark green). Mapping obtained from MNR (LIO) Make A Natural Heritage Map (provincial layers) on 5 June 2019.

None of the trees on the site have been identified as “distinctive trees” under the City’s guideline definitions (i.e. > 50 cm in diameter).

The remainder of the trees on the property are outside of the developable area will all be retained. They are described here in order to inform the necessary conservation measures required for their protection during construction. A Tree Conservation Report is being developed separately.

3.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PROJECT

The Ottawa Valley Wild Bird Care Centre is planning to build a wild bird rehabilitation centre on the subject property. For the purposes of planning, the new centre is considered to fall under the use of “animal hospital” as defined in the City of Ottawa’s Official Zoning Bylaw (Ottawa Letter 19 July 2018).

The proposed site plan allows for the main centre with a footprint of 623.25 m² (Figure 7). An attached partially covered outdoor porch (hard surface aviary space) will provide a fly area for recovering birds. A drop-off shelter is planned to the east of the main building, as well as the required 25 parking spaces. A septic tank and leaching bed is planned south of the main building. A well is proposed to the west of the building, and self-contained water tank for fire suppression is planned on the east side of the building.




Figure 7 Proposed Site Plan, 8520 McArton Road.

4.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND MITIGATION

Potential impacts have been thoroughly assessed and are described below, together with proposed mitigation measures.

4.1 Wetlands and Groundwater

All proposed development (main centre, parking, storage) has been placed well outside a 30 m setback from the Provincially Significant Wetland to mitigate any potential impacts. This is because 30 m is a standard distance above which it has been shown that impacts due to construction, etc. are mitigated (Environment Canada 2004). All proposed development has been placed outside of a 25 m setback from the unevaluated wetland boundary.

The septic bed location will also be placed to the south of the main building, at least 35 m in all directions from the PSW. Measures will be taken to ensure that there will be no chemical or sediment effluent entering the wetland. The area will be revegetated with native species and there will be no permanent development within the 25 m setback limit.

A water tank for fire suppression will be placed approximately 25-30 m from the unevaluated wetland boundary on the property. However, the tank is entirely self-contained and has no exchange or flow with the surrounding environment, and therefore will have no impact on the hydrologic function of the wetland.

It is recommended that silt fencing be erected on the PSW (east) side of the site during construction to prevent any sediment flow into the wetland.

4.2 Species at Risk and their Habitat

Two Eastern Meadowlarks were observed foraging, perching and/or singing on the property on three occasions between 2015 and 2019. Eastern Meadowlarks are likely breeding in the large hayfields to the north, where they are heard singing in breeding season. There was no evidence that Eastern Meadowlark are nesting on the property (e.g. adults visiting nest, carrying food, carrying nesting material, nest observation, etc.). For the purposes of the Ontario Endangered Species Act (ESA), an undetermined portion of the property is considered Category 3 habitat (C. Hann, pers. comm. 2019). An IGF was completed and reviewed by MECP (attached).

The relatively small development envelope (approximately 1.3 ha) in Category 3 habitat does not significantly impact Meadowlark because foraging habitat is not limiting in the area (Carolyn Hann, MECP 2019). However, due to requirements by the Ministry of Culture, the entire agricultural field (4.8 ha) must be plowed to “plantable” condition in order to complete a pedestrian archeological survey.

The 4.8 ha area of Cultural Meadow affected by plowing is well under 30 ha threshold required to undertake the permitting process under the ESA (C. Hann, pers.comm. 2019). Therefore, the

Wild Bird Care Centre has registered the proposed development activity with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP). To mitigate habitat loss due to this fieldwork, the field will be allowed to regenerate from the roots of existing vegetation, and overseeded in bare areas with a hayfield mix with a majority of Timothy (*Phleum pretense*) and Perennial Ryegrass (*Lolium perenne*), suitable for grassland birds. The area will be monitored and managed as Meadowlark habitat.

Further recommendations:

- It is recommended that the minimal loss of Monarch nectaring and breeding habitat be offset by plantings of a suite of native wildflower species, including Milkweeds (*Asclepias* sp.) in landscape plantings at the front of the building. In this way, concentrated larval and feeding habitat will replace less concentrated grassland habitat, resulting in no negative impacts on the ecological function of the field to Monarchs.
- It is recommended that no loose fill be stockpiled on site, and that the construction site be fully fenced with a perimeter fence for the duration of construction, to limit potential access to the site by nesting turtles, including Blanding's Turtle.

5.0 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed new Wild Bird Care Centre lies in close proximity to the Manion's Corners PSW and unevaluated wetland. Shallow soils and drainage of the shallow aquifer to the PSW in the east suggest that the groundwater is sensitive in this area. A portion of the area has also been identified as a foraging area (Category 3 habitat under the Ontario ESA) for Eastern Meadowlark, a Threatened grassland bird species.

No other species at risk, regionally rare species, Significant Woodlands or Significant Wildlife habitat have been observed or will be impacted by this proposed development.

Consequently, the following mitigations have been undertaken to minimize potential impacts in the design of the WBCC:

- Development of the main centre, septic, and well bed will be a minimum of 30 m from the PSW in order to reduce the possibility of impacts of construction and/or ongoing maintenance (e.g. nutrient flow through aquifer) on the PSW.
- Parking lot runoff will be treated prior to discharge. Grading and temporary soil disturbance just within the 25 m unevaluated wetland setback is required to complete this mitigation and will be fenced with sediment fencing and revegetated following construction.
- A self-contained water tank for fire suppression will be placed approximately 25-30 m from the unevaluated wetland, and this is anticipated to have no ongoing impacts.
- The loss of Eastern Meadowlark foraging habitat (Category 3) due to the building envelope and required archeological surveys will be mitigated by reseeding of the

undeveloped rear of the property (~3.5 ha) with a native seed mix suitable for grassland birds. The activity was registered under the ESA following requirements of the MECP. An IGF has been completed, submitted, and approved by MECP.

The following additional recommendations are made:

- No loose fill should be stockpiled on site. A professional biologist should be notified for advice in the event that turtles are observed in the construction area.
- During construction, silt fencing should be maintained across the east side of the site, to prevent sediment flow into the PSW.
- Perimeter (exclusionary) fencing should be erected around the construction site for the duration of construction.
- Native plant forb species including Milkweeds (*Asclepias* sp.) should be used in landscaping, where possible sourced from local native stock, with additional native tree plantings along the margin of the woodland at the western property boundary.
- Optional native plantings of local tree species such as Bur Oak, Trembling Aspen, or White Birch could be added to the margins of the woodlands on the site, to provide an additional protective buffer.

Taken together, the site plan and mitigations ensure that the proposal is consistent with the natural heritage policies in the Provincial Policy Statement, and supporting policies of the City of Ottawa.

The information contained in this EIS is accurate and complete, to the best of my knowledge. I trust the aforementioned satisfy the requirements of an Environmental Impact Statement.

Please contact me if you have any questions on this Environmental Impact Study.

Holly J. Bickerton, B.A.Sc., MES
Consulting Ecologist, Ottawa, Ontario.

6.0 REFERENCES

Brunton, D.F. 2005. Vascular Plants of the City of Ottawa, with Identification of Significant Species. Appendix A of Ottawa's Urban Natural Areas Environmental Evaluation Study. City of Ottawa, March 2005.

City of Ottawa. 2018. Significant Woodlands: Guidelines for Identification, Evaluation, and Impact Assessment.

https://documents.ottawa.ca/sites/default/files/significant_woodlands_draft_guidelines_FINAL.pdf

GeoFirma Engineering Ltd. 2018. Hydrogeological Study, 8574 McArton Road, Ottawa, Ontario. Project No. 18-243-1, Sept 18 2018.

Hann, Carolyn. 2019. Personal Communication. Management Biologist, Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, Kemptonville District. Communication with H. Bickerton on 28 June 2019

Lee, H.T., W. Bakowsky, J. Riley, J. Bowles, M. Puddister, P. Uhlig, and S. Murray. 1998. Ecological Land Classification for Southern Ontario. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources.

Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (OMNR). 2010. Natural Heritage Reference Manual for Natural Heritage Policies of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2005. Second Edition. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario. 248 pp.

Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (OMNR). 2011. Survey Methodology under the Endangered Species Act, 2007: *Dolichonyx oryzivorus* (Bobolink). Updated 4/7/2011.

Ontario Geological Survey 2019. Bedrock Geology of Ontario. Web application via Google Earth. Available at <http://www.geologyontario.mndm.gov.on.ca/>.

Ontario Geological Survey 2019. Surficial Geology of Ontario. Web application via Google Earth. Available at <http://www.geologyontario.mndm.gov.on.ca/>.

7.0 LIMITATIONS

The investigations undertaken with respect to this report and conclusions or recommendations reflect the consultant's professional judgement based on the site conditions observed at the time of the site inspection, on the identified dates, and on information available at the time of preparation of this report.

The report has been prepared for a specific application to this site and is based in part upon visual observation of the site. These observations occurred at various locations during a specific time interval as outlined in the report. Unless otherwise stated, the findings cannot be extended to previous or future site conditions, or to portions of the site which were not subject to the direct investigation.

If site conditions or applicable standards change, or if additional information becomes available, then modifications to the conclusions and recommendations in this report may become necessary.

Appendix 1 Photos of ELC Vegetation Communities, 8520 McArton Road

Photo 1. Cultural Meadow from centre of 8520McArton Road, facing NW to McArton Rd.



Photo 2. Cultural Meadow.



Photo 3. Willow Thicket Swamp (SWT2-2); unevaluated wetland area adjacent to Manions Corners PSW.



Photo 4. Cultural Woodland at west boundary 8520 McArton Road.



Photo 5. Eastern White Cedar Coniferous Forest at south and southeastern end of property.



Appendix 2 Bird Observations on and near 8520 McArton Road, 2015-2019.

| Common Name | On property | Adjacent/ Flyover | S Rank |
|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| Alder Flycatcher | | x | S5B |
| American Crow | x | x | S5B |
| American Goldfinch | x | x | S5B |
| American Robin | x | x | |
| American Woodcock | | x | |
| Black-and-White Warbler | | x | |
| Black-capped Chickadee | | x | S5 |
| Blue Jay | | x | S5 |
| Brown-headed Cowbird | X | | Non-native |
| Canada Goose | | x | |
| Chipping Sparrow | | x | |
| Common Grackle | x | x | S5B |
| Common Yellowthroat | | x | S5B |
| Downy Woodpecker | | x | |
| Eastern Meadowlark | x | x | |
| Eastern Phoebe | x | x | |
| Great-crested Flycatcher | | x | |
| Hairy Woodpecker | | x | |
| Mourning Dove | | x | |
| Northern Flicker | | x | |
| Red-eyed Vireo | | x | |
| Red-winged Blackbird | x | x | S5B |
| Ring-billed Gull | | x | |
| Song Sparrow | x | | S5B |
| Swamp Sparrow | | x | |
| Swan sp. | | x | |
| Wilson's Snipe | x | | |
| White-breasted Nuthatch | | x | |
| Yellow Warbler | x | x | S5B |

Appendix 3 Information Gathering Form – submitted to MECP

**Information Gathering Form for activities
that may affect species or habitat protected
under the *Endangered Species Act***

| | |
|-----------------|---------------|
| Tracking Number | Lead District |
|-----------------|---------------|

Note: It is anticipated that the completion of this form will take multiple extended sessions. It is recommended that proponents download and save the form and the associated guide book to their local hard drive in order to more easily facilitate this task. Adobe Reader 10 is required to save, view and add data to the form. If you require this version of Adobe, select download to download it for free. To review the entire form, select view. It is strongly recommended that while completing the form, proponents read all associated tabs and help buttons to ensure the information requirements are clearly understood.

Personal information in this form is collected under the authority of Section 53 of the *Endangered Species Act, 2007*. The information provided will be used for the purposes of administering the Act and its Regulations. Questions about the use of this information should be directed to the species at risk representative at the local MNR office (http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/en/ContactUs/2ColumnSubPage/STEL02_179002.html) for the location where the proposed activity will take place.

Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory.

1. Contact Information

Proponent Contact Information check this box if the proponent is a private individual

| | | |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Legal Last Name* | Legal First Name* | Legal Middle Initial(s) |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|

Full Mailing Address

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|------------|
| Unit No. | Street No.* | Street Name* | P.O. Box |
| Rural Route | Postal Station | Lot No. | Concession |
| City/Town* | Province* | Postal Code* | |
| Telephone No.* (613) 291-1137 ext. | Fax No. | Email (if available) | |

Primary Contact for Proponent

Is the proponent the primary contact for this form?*

Yes No

| | | |
|------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Last Name* | First Name* | Middle Initial(s) |
|------------|-------------|-------------------|

Position/Title

Legal Name of Organization/Company

Full Business Mailing Address

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|
| Unit No. | Street No.* | Street Name* | P.O. Box |
| Rural Route | Postal Station | Lot No. | Concession |
| City/Town* | Province* | Postal Code* | |
| Business Telephone No.* 613 730 7725 ext. | Business Fax No. N/A | Business Email (if available) | |

Authorization*

X I, _____ (proponent's name), authorize
_____ (primary contact's name) to
disclose information required by the Ministry of Natural Resources for the purpose of administering the *Endangered Species Act, 2007* and its Regulations and in accordance with the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 1990*.

X I hereby certify that the information provided is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Species at Risk Field Surveys

Has MNR determined whether species at risk surveys required?*

If proponent has not already contacted the local MNR office regarding species surveys, please do so before proceeding with the form.

Yes, surveys required No, surveys not required

Is the primary contact for the proponent, the same as the principal species at risk surveyor?*

Yes No

Species at risk principal surveyor contact information

| | | |
|------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Last Name* | First Name* | Middle Initial(s) |
|------------|-------------|-------------------|

Position/Title

Legal Name of Organization/Company

Full Business Mailing Address

| | | | |
|----------|-------------|--------------|----------|
| Unit No. | Street No.* | Street Name* | P.O. Box |
|----------|-------------|--------------|----------|

| | | | |
|-------------|----------------|---------|------------|
| Rural Route | Postal Station | Lot No. | Concession |
|-------------|----------------|---------|------------|

| | | |
|------------|-----------|--------------|
| City/Town* | Province* | Postal Code* |
|------------|-----------|--------------|

| | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|
| Business Telephone No.* ext. | Business Fax No. | Business Email (if available) |
|---------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|

Summarize any species at risk surveyors experience and knowledge (i.e., relevant qualifications)

Holly Bickerton (B.A.Sc., MES) is an independent consultant with over 18 years of experience in eastern and central Ontario. She has expertise in fieldwork, ecological research, habitat restoration, and policy. She is certified in Ontario Wetland Evaluation and Ecological Land Classification, and has completed many SAR surveys for the public , non-government and private sectors. She has recently completed two terms as a member of COSSARO.

Names of the other surveyors who assisted in (or will be assisting in) carrying out the species at risk surveys:

None.

2. Activity Overview

Primary Activity Sector (please check one)*

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> aggregate | <input type="checkbox"/> renewable energy (hydroelectric) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> agriculture | <input type="checkbox"/> renewable energy (wind/solar/biofuel) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> construction or development | <input type="checkbox"/> transportation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> mining | <input type="checkbox"/> existing infrastructure (e.g., utility corridors, dams, drains) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> forestry | <input type="checkbox"/> research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> non-renewable energy (e.g., oil and gas, nuclear) | <input type="checkbox"/> tourism, culture, recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> other (specify) Not for profit Conservation Sector | |

Briefly summarize **what the proposed activity entails**, its **purpose** (e.g., research, constructing a home, building a subdivision, quarry establishment/operation, road construction, etc.), the **general location** of the activity and **current land uses** at that location.

If this information is available in an existing report, proponents can copy and paste the relevant information from the report(s) into the space provided below. Please reference the title, author and date of the report(s) from which the copy and paste sections originate.

Brief Description

The Wild Bird Care Centre has purchased a recently severed ~17.3 ha property in Ashton (8520 McArton Road, Ottawa) for a new facility, considered by the City of Ottawa as an animal hospital. The WBCC annually rehabilitates upward of 3000 wild birds, and since 2010 has admitted and treated 21 different avian species at risk. There was a Scoped EIS completed for the severance in 2018 (by Holly Bickerton), and a severance was granted on condition that surveys for SAR grassland birds be completed prior to any construction, and that future building envelopes respect setbacks to protect potential grassland habitat as well as a nearby PSW . No SAR have been identified in the 1km NHIC grid square (Make a Map). The property has been visited four times by Holly Bickerton and no Bobolink, Eastern Meadowlark or other SAR have been observed on the property during breeding season, but the site does contain some potentially suitable habitat (a hayfield) and standard protocols have not been completed to date. The EIS (Bickerton 2018, for 8574 McArton Road) will be submitted with this IGF. A single Monarch (SC) was observed in fall 2015. No Barn Swallows, Chimney Swifts or have been observed on the property and no structures exist. The habitat is unsuitable for Whippoorwill and Common Nighthawk. No Butternut were observed.

P

The WBCC plans to build a new, dedicated rehabilitation facility for injured wild birds. The facility is planned for 588 m2 facility, 288 m2 attached aviaries, a few small outbuildings, and a small pond within the identified building envelope (see draft Site Plan attached). This will involve:

- Vegetation clearing (previously a leased hayfield till 2018)
- Soil excavation

The purpose of this IGF is to confirm the requirement for grassland bird surveys and any other SAR concerns prior to development.

General location

The property under study is found at 8520 McArton Road, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K0A 1B0 (45.205500°N, -76.052634° W). : Legal description is as follow: PT LT 4 CON 12 GEOGRAPHIC TOWNSHIP OF GOULBOURN BEING PART 1 ON, PLAN 4R-31570. It is Part 1 of PIN04444-0010 LT.

Current land uses (including Aboriginal land uses, where known) on/surrounding the proposed activity location

According to Schedule B of the City of Ottawa Official Plan, the area is zone General Rural. The currently land use is agricultural. The field has until recently been leased as a hayfield.

Duration of the Proposed Activity

Targeted start date for the activity (yyyy-mm-dd)

Targeted completion date for the activity (yyyy-mm-dd)

Environmental Assessment

What Environmental Assessment has been or will be done in association with this activity? (Enter N/A if not applicable)

A scoped Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was completed in 2018 (Bickerton 2018) for the City of Ottawa prior to a severance of 8574 McArton Road (Bickerton 2018).

The City of Ottawa has requested a new EIS be completed prior to building approval (contact is Sami Rehman, City of Ottawa, Environmental Planner).

3. Activity Details – Where, When, and How

Activity Location(s): 1

Provide detailed descriptions of the location(s) of the proposed activity according to each of the items below. In cases where the activity will occur in multiple locations, the following should be described for each location.

A. Location*

X | Geographic coordinates of the activity location

X | Legal Description of activity location

Geographic coordinates of the activity location

| UTM Map Datum | Zone | Coordinates – Easting | Coordinates – Northing |
|---------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Latitude | Longitude | | |

Legal Description of activity location

Civic Address

| Unit No. | Street No. | Street Name | P.O. Box | Rural Route |
|---|------------|--|--|---|
| City/Town | | Province | | Postal Code |
| Lot(s) and Concession(s) Pt Lot 4 Con 12 | | Assessment Roll Number(s) PINI 04444-0010 LT (Part 1) | | Geographic Township(s) West Carleton- March Ward 5 |
| Local Municipality(ies) | | | Regional Municipality, County or Territorial District(s) | |

B. Land Ownership

Indicate the land ownership for the proposed activity (please check all that apply)

- Federal crown land/water or protected area First Nation Reserve
 Municipal land/water X | Private property
 Provincial crown land/water Provincial crown land – provincial park/conservation reserve
 Other (identify)

C. MNR district(s) where the activity will take place

D. Identify the **ecological communities** (e.g., agricultural (hayfield, crop, pasture), forest type and age (deciduous, coniferous, mixed wood; early/late successional forest), tallgrass prairie, etc.) at and surrounding the activity location.

If this information is available in an existing report, proponents can copy and paste the relevant information from the report(s) into the space provided below. Please reference the title, author and date of the report(s) from which the copy and paste sections originate.

Ecological Communities

The proposed development will occur at the front of the new lot, which is entirely Cultural Meadow (CUM1).

Cultural Meadow (CUM): The cultural meadow is dominated by forbs such as Red Clover (*Trifolium pretense**), Black Medick (*Medicago lupulina**), Bird's-foot Trefoil (*Lotus corniculatus**), Daisy Fleabane (*Erigeron annuus*), and Queen Anne's Lace (*Daucus carota*) as well as forage grasses such as Smooth Brome (*Bromus inermis*) and Timothy (*Phleum pratense**).

At the eastern edge there is a Willow Thicket Swamp (SWT) which is contiguous with the PSW Manion's Corners/ Long Swamp. No significant features were observed in this area.

The southern margin of the lot consists of Eastern White Cedar Forest, and at the western margin there is a Deciduous Swamp dominated by American Elm. See Map in Figure 2. p. 12 of attached EIS.

Activity Methodology

(How each stage of the activity will be carried out)

In Table 1, please provide a detailed **description** of the various components of the proposed activity over the activity's full lifespan. In the context of this form, "activity" is defined broadly to include all components associated with all stages of the activity including, but not limited to, site access and investigation, site preparation and construction, operation and maintenance, closure, decommissioning and completion, and rehabilitation and restoration stages. **The level of detail provided should reflect the size and complexity of the activity.**

If this information is available in an existing report, proponents can copy and paste the relevant information from the report(s) into Table 1. Please reference the title, author and date of the report(s) from which the copy and paste sections originate.

Table 1. Detailed description of the various components/stages of the proposed activity.

| Component / Stage | Targeted Dates | | Detailed Description of Methodology |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|
| | Start Date (yyyy-mm-dd) | Completion Date (yyyy-mm-dd) | |
| Site access and investigation | 2015-09-23 2016-10-6 2018-06-22 2018-07-04 in 2019: 2019-05-15 | 2019-06-30 | 23 Sept 2015, 9:30am-12:30 pm: Site orientation, topography, wildlife, wetland boundary confirmation, ELC, SAR habitat 6 October 2016, 10:30-11:15, Confirmation of wetland boundary and proposed lot line, wildlife observations 22 June 2018, 2:30- 4pm, Flagging of wetland boundary, wildlife observations 4 July 2018 9:30-10:30, flagging of wetland boundary, wildlife observation. Additional surveys planned for May- June 2019, to focus on grassland birds. |
| Site preparation and construction | 2019-10-01 (pending) | 2020-12 (approx.) | Vegetation clearing: No vegetation removal will take place between April 15 th and July 31 st to minimize any potential impact on breeding birds. Soil excavation: If soil contamination is detected, once excavated, appropriate soil management is essential to avoid contamination of the environment. Following excavation, clean soil will be used to backfill and rehabilitate the area. Any water in the excavations will be pumped and directed to a water treatment system or to an authorized site. Standard measures will be taken to minimize the risk of spills. Waste management and residual material: Comply with the applicable rules and regulations for waste management. Manage in accordance with the principle of 4Rs: reduction, reuse, recycling and recovery. At the end of the work, collect all waste, including empty containers and packaging. Care will be taken to prevent accidental spills during handling, packaging and transport of debris and contaminated soils. Machinery use: Equipment in good operating condition and in compliance with emission regulations will be used. Engines will be turned off when machinery is not on operation. |
| Operation and maintenance | | | Non-profit development: All landscaping will use only locally appropriate native species. Re-establish native vegetation along new or disturbed edges of natural features by seeding or transplanting locally appropriate native species. Pond that is required as water reservoir for fire suppression will be vegetated and become a fenced in rehabilitation area for waterbirds (See site plan). |

| Component / Stage | Targeted Dates | | Detailed Description of Methodology |
|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | Start Date (yyyy-mm-dd) | Completion Date (yyyy-mm-dd) | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Are there any site-related or technical limitations that restrict how this activity may be carried out?

None

4. Indication of Species at Risk and Habitat Found at or near the Activity Location

Records Review

Proponents are requested to outline what protected species at risk or habitats may be present at or near the proposed activity location. An activity is considered “near” a species at risk or its habitat if the activity is physically located within a reasonable distance of the species or habitat **and** there is a reasonable likelihood that the adverse effects of the activity will affect the species or extend into its habitat. In outlining this, proponents should consider the area that is reasonably likely to be affected by any of the stages of the proposed activity. This area may extend beyond the physical (direct) footprint of the activity itself.

While the local MNR office may be able to provide advice for completing this information, proponents are expected to conduct a records review. Some links to information sources can be found on page 1 of this form under the information sources tab. The results of the records review should be recorded in Table 3. The results of the records review should be recorded in Table 3.

Species at Risk Surveys

Where there is insufficient species at risk data or information, proponents may also be required to conduct species at risk surveys at or near the proposed activity location. The methodology and results from these species surveys can be recorded in Tables 2 and 3.

An ESA authorization (e.g., a permit under clause 17(2)(b) of the Act) may be required to conduct species at risk surveys.

Determining the presence of species at risk and their habitats often requires a higher degree of knowledge and expertise that may not be a standard requirement for routine environmental assessments. Species at risk surveys must be undertaken by a qualified professional who is familiar with the species/habitat anticipated to be at or near the proposed activity location. Survey methods must be specific to each species at risk (or groups of similar species) that is reasonably expected to be found at or near the proposed activity location. **It is strongly recommended that proponents contact the local MNR office prior to conducting any surveys to confirm whether surveys are required**, that they are conducted using appropriate methods and protocols, and that any required ESA or other MNR authorizations are obtained. *Note: costs associated with conducting surveys are the responsibility of the proponent.*

In Table 2, please describe any surveys that have been (or will be) undertaken to assess what protected species at risk and habitats may be present at or near the activity location.

If this information is available in an existing report, proponents can copy and paste the relevant information from the report(s) into Table 2. Please reference the title, author and date of the report(s) from which the copy and paste sections originate.

4. Indication of Species at Risk and Habitat Found at or near the Activity Location

Table 2. Overview of species at risk surveys to outline what species at risk and habitats may be present at or near the activity location

Check this box if no species at risk surveys have been done or are planned

| Targeted species | Start/End dates and times for surveys | Detailed description of survey protocols and methods | Search Effort (e.g., number of searches, search time, transects per area, number of surveyors, number of survey stations) | Has the survey been completed? |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Bobolink | 2019-05 to 2019-06 | Two male Bobolinks were observed on the property in late Sept 2015 and assumed to be in migration, which was ongoing at the time. Additional surveys following the standard MNRF protocol methods will be completed beginning in the last week of May 2019 and continue as per Draft Protocol dated 04/07/2011. | On Sept 23 2015 one surveyor visited the site for approximately 1 hour with no Bobolink observed. On June 22 and July 4 2018 one surveyor (HB) visited the site (approx. 13:00) for approximately one hour each and no Bobolinks were observed. In May-June 2019, one surveyor (HB) will complete MNRF protocol for this species, in and near the proposed building envelope. | <input type="checkbox"/> completed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yet to be completed |
| Eastern Meadowlark | 2019-05 to 2019-06 | Surveys following the standard MNRF protocol methods will be completed beginning in the last week of May 2019 and continue as per Survey Protocol dated August 2013. | On Sept 23 2015 one surveyor visited the site for approximately 1 hour with two Meadowlarks observed at the location identified in the attached file. These were presumed migrating. On June 22 and July 4 2018 one surveyor (HB) visited the site (approx. 13:00) for approximately one hour each and no Meadowlarks were observed. In May-June 2019, one surveyor (HB) will complete MNRF protocol for this species, in and near the proposed building envelope. | <input type="checkbox"/> completed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yet to be completed |

| Targeted species | Start/End dates and times for surveys | Detailed description of survey protocols and methods | Search Effort (e.g., number of searches, search time, transects per area, number of surveyors, number of survey stations) | Has the survey been completed? |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Butternut | 2015 and 2018 | There is almost no treed habitat within the affected area at the front of 8520 McArton Road. While there are a few trees along the road allowance, none are Butternut. Trees were surveyed as part of the 2018 EIS (Bickerton 2018). | One surveyor (HB) surveyed the entire property for ~2 hrs in Sept 2015, and this area of the property again in June and July 2018. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> completed <input type="checkbox"/> yet to be completed |
| | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> completed <input type="checkbox"/> yet to be completed |
| | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> completed <input type="checkbox"/> yet to be completed |

In Table 3, please record:

- all protected species at risk occurrences and habitat observations made at or near the proposed activity location;
- the [SARO list](#) status for each species;
- the rationale which indicates that the species or habitat may be present at or near the proposed activity location. This rationale should be based on information and data collected during the records review and through field surveys (if applicable).

If this information is available in an existing report, proponents can copy and paste the relevant information from the report(s) into Table 3. Please reference the title, author and date of the report(s) from which the copy and paste sections originate.

Please submit all new observation data for any endangered or threatened species to the Natural Heritage Information Centre (NHIC) using the Rare Species reporting form available at: http://nhic.mnr.gov.on.ca/species/species_report.cfm.

Any new observation data for other provincially tracked species (e.g., special concern species) that may have been observed at or near the proposed activity location should also be submitted to the NHIC.

Table 3: Summary of species at risk and their habitats found at or near the proposed activity location. Identify information sources as required. Note: It is recommended that representative photos of the habitat areas and features found at or near the proposed location of the activity be submitted with this form (opportunity to add attachments is in the next section). Be sure to include the time, date and location where each photo was taken.

| | Species 1 | Species 2 |
|---|--|---|
| Species name* | Bobolink | Eastern Meadowlark |
| Species status in Ontario* (provided in the SARO List) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Threatened <input type="checkbox"/> Endangered | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Threatened <input type="checkbox"/> Endangered |
| Presence/absence of species/habitat at or near the proposed activity location* | <input type="checkbox"/> individuals of the species absent <input type="checkbox"/> individuals of the species present | <input type="checkbox"/> individuals of the species absent <input type="checkbox"/> individuals of the species present |
| Number of individuals observed and how (e.g., visual sighting, auditory observation, etc.) Also indicate life stage of the individuals (e.g., adult, juvenile, fruiting, etc.) where possible, dates the observations were made, the geographic coordinates of the observations, etc. | <p>No individuals have been observed or heard on this property during any site visit.</p> <p>There is suitable habitat for Bobolink on the property.</p> <p>In June 2018, HB visited the site for a single visit and did not observe any Bobolink. However, the MNRF/MECP protocol was not completed.</p> <p>In May-June 2019, the Bobolink protocol will be completed to confirm whether or not this species is present as a breeder.</p> | <p>Two individuals were observed on 23 September 2015, out of the breeding season and within the migratory window for this species.</p> <p>There is suitable habitat for Meadowlark on the property but the MNRF/MECP protocol has not been completed.</p> <p>In May-June 2019, the Eastern Meadowlark protocol will be completed to confirm whether or not this species is present as a breeder.</p> |

| | Species 1 | Species 2 |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Detailed ecological description of the landscape. Include the Ecological Land Classification (ELC), Forest Ecosystem Classification (FEC), or Aquatic Resource Area (ARA) information, slope, aspect, soils, substrate, dominant plant species, associated plant species, etc.. If you require assistance in completing the required information, please contact the local MNR office.</p> | <p>Below is the ELC description for the vegetation community relevant to the proposal. For further information and map, please see attached EIS (Bickerton 2018).</p> <p>Cultural Meadow (CUM): The cultural meadow is dominated by forbs such as Red Clover (<i>Trifolium pretense</i>*), Black Medick (<i>Medicago lupulina</i>*), Bird's-foot Trefoil (<i>Lotus corniculatus</i>*), Daisy Fleabane (<i>Erigeron annuus</i>), and Queen Anne's Lace (<i>Daucus carota</i>) as well as forage grasses such as Smooth Brome (<i>Bromus inermis</i>) and Timothy (<i>Phleum pratense</i>*).</p> | <p>Below is the ELC description for the vegetation community relevant to the proposal. For further information and map, please see attached EIS (Bickerton 2018).</p> <p>Cultural Meadow (CUM): The cultural meadow is dominated by forbs such as Red Clover (<i>Trifolium pretense</i>*), Black Medick (<i>Medicago lupulina</i>*), Bird's-foot Trefoil (<i>Lotus corniculatus</i>*), Daisy Fleabane (<i>Erigeron annuus</i>), and Queen Anne's Lace (<i>Daucus carota</i>) as well as forage grasses such as Smooth Brome (<i>Bromus inermis</i>) and Timothy (<i>Phleum pratense</i>*).</p> |
| <p>Description of habitat features on site. Note any key habitat features (e.g., nests, hibernacula, calving areas, dens, roost trees, etc) observed at or near the activity location including the geographic coordinates of the observations. If you require assistance in completing the requested information, please contact the local MNR office species at risk representative.</p> | <p>The property consists of a suitable size (>5ha) of grassland for Bobolink, and there are known to be Bobolink in the area. The mixed grass-forb composition and successional stage of the hayfield are appropriate for Bobolink, although none have been observed to date.</p> | <p>The vegetation on the property is suitable for Eastern Meadowlark, and there are known to be Meadowlarks in the area. The mixed grass-forb composition and successional stage of the hayfield are appropriate for Meadowlarks although none have been observed during breeding season. There are perches surrounding the property (e.g. utility wires, treed edges).</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>How and when the species is (or may be) using the habitat to carry out its life processes</p> <p>Indicate if the habitat is being used by the species for reproduction, rearing, hibernation, over-wintering, migration, feeding, resting (including predator avoidance), dispersal, daily movement, or any other life process (please specify). If it is not clear which life process the habitat is supporting, please indicate "unknown". If you require assistance in completing the requested information, please contact the local MNR office species at risk representative.</p> | <p>Bobolink have not been observed on the property but it is possible that they use the habitat during breeding season, and possible migration.</p> | <p>Two Eastern Meadowlarks have been observed on the property during migration season (Sept 23 2015).</p> <p>It is possible that they use the habitat during breeding season, although subsequent visits (June and July 2018) did not result in any observation.</p> |
| <p>Other available information that suggests the effects of the activity, not just the physical (direct) footprint, may overlap with species at risk occurrences and/or habitat (e.g., species expert's opinion, etc.).</p> | <p>The building envelope has been limited to a 100 m depth from the McArton Road frontage to minimize impacts.</p> | <p>The building envelope has been limited to a 100 m depth from the McArton Road frontage to minimize impacts.</p> |

5. Activity and Species at Risk Maps and Photos

Provide one or more maps of appropriate scale that clearly illustrate the following items. In cases where the activity will occur in multiple locations, the following should be illustrated for each location.

- Ecological Land Classifications (ELC), Forest Ecosystem Classifications (FEC), or Aquatic Resource Areas (ARA) for the location and surrounding area (if available);
- Topographic information;
- Any designated natural features;
- Name(s) of any waterbodies occurring at or near the activity location (if applicable);
- Current land uses (if available);
- Location and boundaries (i.e. footprint) of the proposed activity **in relation to the surrounding landscape**;
- Location of each species at risk occurrence and habitat found at or near the proposed activity location. Also, include the location and description of any habitat features (e.g., nest, hibernaculum, calving area, vernal pools, spawning beds) found at or near the proposed activity location; and
- Data sources, scale, north arrow and legend for the maps.

Use of aerial photography and satellite imagery is strongly encouraged. Please indicate the date aerial photos or satellite images were taken as well as the date maps were created.

Please list and attach relevant maps, shapefiles, photos and satellite images that are available.

Do not include personal information on maps, aerial photos and satellite images.

List of Attached Documents

Note: The total space for attachments is limited to 25MB. Links to existing FTP sites containing photos and other materials for the proposed activity can be indicated in the list of attached documents space.

The following documents will accompany this pdf to SAROntario@ontario.ca.

- Scoped EIS Form: 8574 McArton Road, Holly J. Bickerton, Consulting Ecologist. (Contains ELC mapping, nearby natural features, PSW boundaries, current land use information, location of SAR habitat)

- Draft Site Plan, Ottawa Valley Wild Bird Care Centre, May 2019 (in development).

-Map of observation of approximate location of Eastern Meadowlark, Sept 23 2015 (presumed migrating).

6. Species at Risk and Habitat that may be Affected by the Activity

In Table 4, please provide your interpretation of:

- the protected species at risk and habitats that are likely to be affected by the proposed activity; and
- how and to what extent these protected species and habitats may be affected. Where the proponent requires assistance in completing the information in this part of the form, contact the local MNR office species at risk representative.

This information and other information submitted in this form will be considered by MNR when assessing and determining whether a proposed activity is likely to contravene subsections 9(1) or 10(1) of the ESA and thus whether it is advisable for the proponent to apply for and obtain an overall benefit permit under clause 17(2)(c) of the ESA prior to proceeding with the proposed activity to avoid contravening the Act.

| Species affected by activity | How and to what extent each species or habitat may be <i>positively</i> affected | How and to what extent each species or habitat may be <i>adversely</i> affected |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| Bobolink | <p>There may be positive effects of a proximate Wild Bird Care Centre on SAR birds in that trained avian specialists will be present in the event that individuals require care.</p> <p>The new facility will improve care and increase capacity for rehabilitation of all injured wild birds in the Ottawa Valley, including many SAR from across the region. The WBCC treats over 3000 birds annually including SAR species. Since 2010, the WBCC has treated 21 SAR bird species including Chimney Swift, Least Bittern, Louisiana Waterthrush, Bank Swallow, Whippoorwill, Meadowlark, Bobolink, and raptors. The building of a new facility will increase their ability to treat injured wild birds.</p> | <p>Unknown. To date Bobolink have not been observed on the property and it is not clear whether they use it for any part of their life cycle.</p> <p>If they are confirmed present, some habitat on the property may be affected by the building of the new facility. It is possible that outdoor aviaries containing raptors such as Bald Eagles may stress SAR birds present.</p> |
| Eastern Meadowlark | <p>There may be positive effects of a proximate WBCC on SAR birds including SAR in that trained avian specialists will be present in the event that individuals require care.</p> <p>The new facility will improve care and increase capacity for rehabilitation of all injured wild birds in the Ottawa Valley, including many SAR from across the region. The WBCC treats over 3000 birds annually including SAR species. Since 2010, the WBCC has treated 21 SAR bird species including Chimney Swift, Least Bittern, Louisiana Waterthrush, Bank Swallow, Whippoorwill, Meadowlark, Bobolink, and raptors. The building of a new facility will increase their ability to treat injured wild birds.</p> | <p>Unknown. To date Eastern Meadowlark have not been observed on the property during breeding season.</p> <p>Eastern Meadowlark have been observed in migration on the property well outside of the area proposed for construction. It is possible that some migration habitat may be affected by the building of the new facility. It is possible that outdoor aviaries containing raptors such as Bald Eagles may stress SAR birds present.</p> |

7. Submission Information

Date this form was submitted to the local MNR office (yyyy-mm-dd)*

Please note: The email function will not work if you do not have your automatic email settings established. In these cases, please save a copy of your form and send it manually to your local MNR office. The list of MNR office email addresses is below for your reference.

Email Client Option*

Default Email Application (e.g., MS Outlook)

Internet Email (e.g., Yahoo or Hotmail. Save the form and send it manually to the MNR office by using internet email service.)

Local MNR office this form is submitted to*

MNR Email Address for reference

Proposal Title*

Authorization*

I, _____ (insert name, hereafter "proponent"), confirm that the information provided in this form is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that a summary of the information provided in this form, excluding any personal information or details that could be used to locate or harm an endangered species, may be posted on the Ministry of Natural Resources Species at Risk website and the Environmental Registry. I also understand that this information will be used for the purpose of administering the *Endangered Species Act, 2007* and its Regulations in accordance with the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 1990*.