

APPENDIX “A”

STUDY TERMS OF REFERENCE

EARTH TECH DISCRIMINATORS

- *Earth Tech's Ecological Services Group has an intimate knowledge of the study area's Environmental Resources through its work on the Environmental Impact Study for Toyota Motor Manufacturing North America's proposed Woodstock plant and CPR's future railway spur to service the study area.*
- *Earth Tech's Ecological Services and Hydrotechnical Groups have excellent working relationships and reputations with the Upper Thames River (UTRCA) and Grand River Conservation Authorities.*
- *Earth Tech has an excellent working relationship with planning and engineering staff at the City of Woodstock and Oxford County.*
- *Earth Tech has a great deal of experience in conducting environmental, hydrotechnical, and engineering studies for industrial lands and Area Plans in general.*

RELEVANT STAFF

The study team for the Environmental Concerns/Issues Component will include the following Earth Tech staff:

Gary Epp, B.Sc., M.Sc., Ph.D. – *Ecological Services Manager & Senior Ecologist*

As head of the Ecological Services Group, Dr. Epp is directly responsible for the management and coordination of a wide range of assignments, including aquatic and terrestrial habitat studies, watershed management plans, wetland evaluations and assessments, restoration plans, and natural resources screening. He has obtained significant experience in, and an excellent reputation for conducting Natural Heritage/Environmental Studies for Area Plans. Dr. Epp also has extensive experience negotiating with a wide range of review agencies, naturalist groups and the public.

Dr. Epp has been responsible for the completion of the Environmental Impact Study and approvals for the Toyota Motor Manufacturing North America's proposed Woodstock Motor Manufacturing Facility. In this role, Dr. Epp has developed an excellent working relationship with key planning and engineering staff at the City of Woodstock and the County of Oxford. He has also been responsible for the completion of environmental surveys and assessments for the future Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) rail spur proposed to service the Toyota Motor Manufacturing Facility.

For the Environmental Concerns/Issues Component the Design Study, Gary will be responsible for coordinating the tasks involved to complete the project, be the prime contact for meetings / public information centres and aid in the preparation of the overall report.

Daniel J. Knee, B.Sc. – Fisheries Biologist

Daniel is an aquatic biologist with Earth Tech's Ecological Services Group specializing in fish and fish habitat. He has conducted numerous fisheries related projects within Ontario, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. He is experienced at providing recommendations for conservation and mitigation strategies, including fisheries assessments and studies related to the management and restoration of fish habitat. Daniel is knowledgeable in current environmental and species at risk legislation, policies and procedures, and has fostered positive working relationships with government and non-government review agencies. Daniel has acquired his Class 1 Electrofishing Certificate (Crew Leader) and his Identification of Ontario Fishes Certificate from the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM). He is also an active member of the Southern Ontario Chapter of the American Fisheries Society and Trout Unlimited Canada (Toronto Chapter).

As a result of providing aquatic input recently for both the Toyota Motor Manufacturing North America and Canadian Pacific Rail Environmental Impact Studies, Daniel has become very familiar with the existing aquatic conditions within the identified study area. This will enable him to promptly assess those areas which require additional field investigations as well as providing a thorough level of constraint analysis for the stretches of the Lampman-Lock Drain and Gordon Pittock Reservoir.

Jillian deMan, B.Sc. – Ecologist

Jillian is an ecologist with Earth Tech's Ecological Services Group. Her expertise includes, wetland and woodland evaluations, environmental impact assessments and flora/fauna surveys. She has also completed the Temperate Wetland Restoration Training Course with the Watershed Science Centre at Trent University and the Ministry of Natural Resources' Wetland Evaluation and Ecological Land Classification (ELC) systems and the Great Lakes Marsh Monitoring Program. With this extensive knowledge base and experience, Jillian is able to offer valuable scientific input for projects with natural heritage components.

Jillian is also intimately familiar with the natural heritage features within the study area for this Eastern Woodstock Design Study, where she has conducted fieldwork within the Vansittart Woods Provincially Significant Wetland, the Locally Significant Eastwoods Wetland, vegetation communities along the Gordon Pittock Reservoir and various vegetation communities scattered within proximity to Township Road 2 and 3. Fieldwork consisted of confirming and adjusting (where fit) wetland boundaries, defining vegetation communities into ELC units as per Ministry of Natural Resources guidelines, assessing community significance as well as identifying development constraints.

Having a supportive role, Jillian will also aid in the completion of the terrestrial/fisheries investigations as well as report preparation and background review and data collection.

REPRESENTATIVE PROJECTS

Environmental Studies within the Study Area

Toyota Motor Manufacturing North America, Proposed Woodstock Manufacturing Facility, Environmental Impact Study. Earth Tech's Ecological Services Group conducted a comprehensive study of ecological resources for the lands including and surrounding the future Toyota Motor Manufacturing Facility immediately east of the City of Woodstock, in Oxford County. A key component of the study involved the identification of environmental protection areas and constraints to development for the proposed industrial land use. The final deliverable of the EIS is an Environmental Management Plan that identifies environmental protection areas, buffer zones, restoration requirements, construction mitigation, approval requirements, and educational opportunities. The EIS final report is scheduled for completion by the end of January 2006.

Canadian Pacific Rail, Proposed Railway Spur for Toyota Lands – Woodstock. Earth Tech recently completed field investigations and assessments of vegetation, avifauna, and fish habitat for a proposed alignment for a railway spur that is to extend from the existing railway line north of the Gordon Pittock Reservoir to the Toyota Manufacturing Facility lands. The results of the field investigations are to be used for an Environmental Impact Study for the future railway spur.

Area Studies and Environmental Studies for Industrial Lands

City of London, W12A London Landfill Area Plan – Ecological Resources Study, London, Ontario. Earth Tech's Ecological Services Group conducted a comprehensive study of ecological resources for the lands including and surrounding the City of London's W12A Landfill Site. Studies included vegetation surveys and mapping, bird surveys, fisheries surveys and aquatic habitat assessments, and drainage evaluation. From the baseline data obtained for the study area, Earth Tech developed a Natural Heritage Strategy that identified areas for protection, preliminary buffer recommendations, and Environmental Impact Studies requirements. [2005].

City of London, Forest City Industrial Lands Subject Lands Status Report, London, Ontario. Earth Tech's Ecological Services Group completed a subject lands evaluation for proposed industrial lands in the south of London. Managed evaluation of woodland patches using the city's Significant Woodland Evaluation Guidelines. [2000].

City of Windsor, Environmental Evaluation for the Ojibway-Yawkey Industrial Community Plan Area, Windsor, Ontario. Earth Tech's Ecological Services Group prepared an Environmental Evaluation Report (EER) as part of the Community Improvement Plan for the Ojibway-Yawkey Industrial Area. The EER presented a net effects analysis for future development adjacent to Candidate Natural Heritage Site # 38. Recommendations included site buffer zones, development guidelines, and recommendations for planning policies. [1996].

Area Studies - Other

Sifton Properties Limited, Bostwick East Area Plan – Natural Heritage Study, London, Ontario. Coordinated and prepared a natural heritage study report for the Bostwick East Area in southwest London. The study involved determination of constraints to development of the area for residential and commercial land uses. [2004].

Tricar Group / Colehill Enterprises, Uplands North Area Plan – Natural Heritage Study London, Ontario. Earth Tech's Ecological Services Group conducted and prepared a natural heritage study and environmental management plan (EMP) for the Uplands North Area. The study involved detailed ecological studies of locally significant wetlands, significant woodlands and watercourses. The success of the EMP and the Area Plan was a function of the facilitation of landowner participation and public consultation. [2002].

Lebovic Enterprises and Fieldgate Developments, Southeast Stouffville Functional Servicing Study, Stouffville, Ontario. Earth Tech provided an ecological and environmental management plan for the southeast quadrant of the town. An environmental impact study provided direction for the identification of areas requiring varying levels of protection and management. Recommendations included guidelines for the establishment of ecological buffers, development guidelines, and the identification of protection measures. [1999].

Town of Pelham, Urban Boundary Expansion Study, Ecological Resources, Pelham. Earth Tech conducted ecological investigations for an expansion study on behalf of the Town of Pelham in response to the town's growing need for additional urban area. As a component of the study ecological resources were investigated in order to determine constraints to development and needs for protection and preservation. The ecological resources study identified ESAs and on-site aquatic resources and provided guidelines for future development. [1998].

City of London & Sifton Properties, River Bend Community Plan, Natural Heritage Study and Environmental Management Plan, London, Ontario. Earth Tech's Ecological Services Group was responsible for the completion of a natural heritage study and an environmental management plan as a major component of the area planning process for the River Bend Area. The study formed the basis for an environmental management strategy and plan that identified natural areas for protection, areas where development could proceed, buffers for protection of natural areas, and management guidelines for areas adjacent to ESAs. [1997].

City of Brantford, Shellard Lane Draft Secondary Plan, Ecological Resources Assessment, Brantford, Ontario. Coordinated ecological studies for a draft secondary plan for the Shellard Lane area. A major component of the study involved the assessment and determination of a development limit line based on ecologically sensitive features, slope stability, and drainage. To determine appropriate setbacks from an adjacent wetland an environmental impact study was conducted as part of the overall study. [1996].

ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS/ISSUES WORK PROGRAM

The following tasks would be required for the completion of the Environmental Concerns/Issues Component of the New Eastern Woodstock Design Study.

Background Review/Data Collection

A significant amount of terrestrial and aquatic information has already been collected within the study area through previous work within the identified study area. *Our approach will include a review of all secondary source woodlot, wetland, watercourse and wildlife habitat information* (i.e. data and/or documentation from a variety of sources, including but not limited to the City of Woodstock, Oxford County, MNR, the Upper Thames River and Grand River Conservation Authorities, etc.). The MNR Natural Heritage Information Centre (NHIC) files will also be consulted to identify the presence of rare floral or faunal species and/or communities within the study area.

Data sources may include digital natural areas mapping (for woodlots, wetlands, and fish habitat information), digital aerial photography, forest resource inventory mapping, wetland evaluation records, and any other relevant reports.

The existing ecological background information that has already been collected for the study area consists of the following:

- Draft Environmental Impact Study for the TMMNA lands, Earth Tech January 2006
- Spring, Summer and Fall Season Natural Inventories for lands within proximity to the Gordon Pittock Reservoir for the proposed new rail spur for Canadian Pacific Rail
- Wetland Evaluation Records for the Vansittart Swamp Provincially Significant Wetland, Eastwoods Locally Significant Wetland, and BB2 Locally Significant Wetland

These studies will also be consulted to aid in the collection of additional relevant background information.

As noted above, the MNR Natural Heritage Information Centre (NHIC) files will also be consulted to confirm the presence/absence of any rare species in the system that could be adversely affected by any future proposed development. A preliminary screening of the NHIC website indicates that there are approximately eight (8) known vulnerable, threatened, or endangered species occurrences within (or partially within) the identified study area. Discussions with the local MNR district ecologist will confirm the identity of these species, specific habitat requirements, and whether the occurrences are recent or historical.

The Background Review component of our work program will include consultation with the relevant local agencies including, but not limited to, the City of Woodstock Planning and Development

Department, Upper Thames River Conservation Authority, Grand River Conservation Authority and the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Agency Consultation and Study Scoping

An Issues Scoping meeting will be held prior to the commencement of fieldwork to obtain any issues or concerns that any of the agencies might have. Those agencies that will be consulted include the Upper Thames River and Grand River Conservation Authorities, the City of Woodstock, the County of Oxford and the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Landowner Consent

Earth Tech assumes that the City of Woodstock will undertake the responsibility of contacting those landowners whose properties contain portions of natural heritage features to obtain their consent for field investigations.

Otherwise, Earth Tech will be pleased to undertake this task, however, with additional cost.

Field Investigations

General Study Area

Investigations will be focused on those areas which have not been studied by Earth Tech where initially, a series of quick visits to confirm these areas will be undertaken.

Terrestrial/Wetland Patch Investigations

Those areas requiring investigations include vegetation communities east of the Vansittart Swamp Provincially Significant Wetland, vegetation communities south of the Gordon Pittock Reservoir, the BB2 Locally Significant Wetland Complex, portions of the Eastwoods Locally Significant Wetland east of the Highway 401 and its surrounding vegetation communities.

Data from both the Toyota Motor Manufacturing North America and Canadian Pacific Rail Environmental Impact Studies will also be used for the Environmental Concerns/Issues Component of the New Eastern Woodstock Design Study.

The detailed investigations of the above-noted communities will include a one-season inventory as well as a description of the site conditions. Wildlife data (including avifauna, mammals, amphibians and reptiles) will be collected in conjunction with the terrestrial vegetation assessment, through the use of incidental clues (visual, auditory) and direct observations. However, *it is anticipated that the majority of wildlife occurrence data will be summarized from secondary source information*, such as the MNR Wetland Evaluation Records. In turn, Earth Tech's field staff will assess the habitat quality or evidence of habitat usage by identified species.

Aquatic Investigations

Earth Tech has completed aquatic investigations for portions of the Lampman-Lock Drain and segments of the Gordon Pittock Reservoir. Investigations included benthic invertebrate surveys, fish surveys (electrofishing and gee type minnow traps) and aquatic habitat assessments.

Those areas not investigated by Earth Tech staff include a stretch of the Lampman-Lock Drain west of County Road No. 4 to the Gordon Pittock Reservoir and the headwater portion north of the Toyota Motor Manufacturing site. Since Earth Tech has a recent data on the majority of the aquatic features within the study area, additional fieldwork would act as supplementary information to fill in any gaps.

Assessment of Significance

Application of City of Woodstock's Natural Heritage Policies and Guidelines

In order to identify components of the Natural Heritage System we will apply the policies and guidelines outlined in the County of Oxford's Official Plan Section 3.2.3.1 – "Natural Heritage System Components". The city's policies provide direction for the identification of Environmental Protection Areas (EPAs) which includes significant wetlands, significant portions of the habitat of *endangered or threatened species* and other significant wildlife habitat, fish habitat, significant valleylands, significant woodlands and significant life science areas of natural and scientific interest.

County of Oxford Official Plan policies, for-the-most-part, address the requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement with regards to Natural Heritage.

Identification of Constraints and Opportunities

The identification of constraints and opportunities will be based primarily on the Natural Heritage System components identified in the previously described task (Assessment of Significance) and the requirements for protection and management of those NHS components. The core constraints may include such features as fish habitat, significant woodlands, significant corridors, Provincially Significant Wetlands, etc. Constraints associated with those core constraints may include requirements for buffers, timing restrictions for construction, etc.

Opportunities will be identified where components of the Natural Heritage System require restoration, or where linkage between components may be enhanced, etc.

Ecological, or Natural Heritage constraints and opportunities will be mapped for the study area in order to allow for an overlay with constraints from the other Background Component Studies.

Environmental Impact Study Requirements

A specific component of the Natural Heritage Strategy will be the provision of Environmental Impact Study (EIS) requirements. Earth Tech will provide identification of those areas, within the study area that will require Environmental Impact Studies prior to the approval of development or site alteration. The requirements for EISs will be consistent with the county's Official Plan policy as outlined in Section 3.2.6 of the OP.

While the County of Oxford's EIS Guidelines provide a protocol for EIS preparation, the Environmental Component of the New Eastern Woodstock Design Study will outline the issues and concerns, to be addressed by EISs, relevant to specific features and areas within the study area. This will enable future EISs for the area to be scoped prior to study initiation.

Official Plan Policy Recommendations

Where appropriate the Natural Heritage Strategy will provide the basis for recommendations regarding land use for those areas within and immediately adjacent to the landfill site property. Recommendations may include the re-designation of unidentified natural communities to open space, environmental protection, agricultural or other appropriate land use designations.

Report Preparation

We propose that the Environmental Concerns/Issues Component of the New Eastern Woodstock Design Study be presented in one document entitled the "New Eastern Woodstock Design Study - Natural Heritage Background Study". The report document will detail and summarize the tasks undertaken (as outlined above), provide mapping of the information gathered and of the constraints and opportunities identified, and will outline the Natural Heritage Strategy for the study area.

APPENDIX “B”

FLORAL SPECIES LIST

EARTH TECH (CANADA) INC.
VASCULAR PLANT SPECIES LIST

SITE: Section 1 - Vansittart Woods PSW
EO: 92422
DATE: Spring/Summer 2006

SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	FAMILY	CC	CM	GRANK	SRANK	WEED	COSEMIC	MNR	REG	SWD 6-2	SWT 1-2	MAS 2-1	SWD 2	MAS 2-1	FO D 7-2	SAM 1	SWD 6-2	
<i>Arisaema triphyllum</i>	Swamp Jack-in-the-pulpit	ARACEAE	5	-2	G5	S5					X								
<i>Betula alleghaniensis</i>	Yellow Birch	BETULACEAE	6	0	G5	S5					X								
<i>Callitriche palustris</i>	Marsh Marigold	RANUNCULACEAE	5	-5	G5	S5					X								
<i>Carex lasiocarpa</i>	Lake-bank Sedge	CYPERACEAE	5	-5	G5	S5					X								
<i>Carpinus canadensis</i>	American Hornbeam	BETULACEAE	6	0	G5	S5													
<i>Cornus stolonifera</i>	Red-osier Dogwood	CORNACEAE	2	-3	G5	S5					X								
<i>Eupatorium maculatum</i>	Spotted Joe-pye Weed	ASTERACEAE	3	-5	G5	S5					X								
<i>Fraxinus nigra</i>	Black Ash	OLEACEAE	7	-4	G5	S5					X								
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	Red Ash/Green Ash	OLEACEAE	3	-3	G5	S5					X								
<i>Impatiens capensis</i>	Spotted Jewelweed	BALSAMINACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5					X								
<i>Juglans nigra</i>	Black Walnut	JUGLANDACEAE	5	3	G5	S4					X								
<i>Oxoclea sensibilis</i>	Sensitive Fern	DRYOPTERIDACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5					X								
<i>Ostrya virginiana</i>	Eastern Hop-hornbeam	BETULACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5					X								
<i>Platanus filiformis</i>	Small Purple fringed orchid	ORCHIDACEAE	4	4	G5	S5					X								
<i>Populus tremuloides</i>	Quaking Aspen	SALICACEAE	2	0	G5	S5					X								
<i>Prunus serotina</i>	Wild Black Cherry	ROSACEAE	3	3	G5	S5					X								
<i>Rhus radicans</i> ssp.	Poison Ivy	ANACARDIACEAE	3	3	G5	S5					X								
<i>Salix</i> sp.	Willow species	SALICACEAE	5	-2	G5	S5					X								
<i>Sambucus canadensis</i>	Common Elderberry	CAPRIFOLIACEAE	5	-2	G5	S5					X								
<i>Typha</i> sp.	Cattail species	TYPHACEAE	3	-5	G5	S5					X								
<i>Typha latifolia</i>	Broad-leaf Cattail	TYPHACEAE	3	-2	G5?	S5					X								
<i>Ulmus americana</i>	American Elm	ULMACEAE	4	0	G5	S5					X								
<i>Acer rubrum</i>	Red Maple	ACERACEAE	5	-3	G5	S5					X								
<i>Acer saccharinum</i>	Silver Maple	ACERACEAE	6	-4	G5	S5					X								
<i>Carex intumescens</i>	Bladder Sedge	CYPERACEAE	6	-4	G5	S5					X								
<i>Carex</i> sp.	Sedge species	CYPERACEAE	7	-1	G5	S5					X								
<i>Cyrtopodium calceolus</i> var. <i>parviflorum</i>	Small Yellow Lady's-slipper	ORCHIDACEAE	5	-5	G5	S5					X								
<i>Iris versicolor</i>	Blueflag	IRIDACEAE	5	-4	G?	SE5 -3					X								
<i>Lysimachia nummularia</i>	Creeping Jennie	PRIMULACEAE	5	-5	G5	S5					X								
<i>Nymphaea odorata</i>	American Water-lily	NYMPHAEACEAE	5	-5	G5	S5					X								
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	Reed Canary Grass	POACEAE	0	-4	G5	S5					X								
<i>Populus deltoides</i>	Eastern Cottonwood	SALICACEAE	4	-1	G5	S5					X								
<i>Potamogeton</i> sp.	Pondweed species	POTAMOGETONACEAE	0	G?	SE5	-2					X								
<i>Solanum dulcamara</i>	Climbing Nightshade	SOLANACEAE	3	-4	G5	S5					X								
<i>Spiraea alba</i>	Narrow-leaved Meadow-sweet	ROSACEAE	7	-5	G5	S5					X								
<i>Symplocarpus foetidus</i>	Skunk Cabbage	ARACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5					X								
<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	Northern White Cedar	CUPRESSACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5					X								

Legend

CC - Coefficient of Conservatism: each native taxon is assigned a rank of 0 to 10 based on its degree of fidelity to a range of synecological parameters. Plants found in a wide variety of plant communities, including disturbed sites, were assigned ranks of 0 to 3. Plants that typically are associated with a specific plant community, but tolerate moderate disturbance, were assigned ranks of 4 to 6. Rankings of 7 to 8 were applied to those plants associated with a plant community in an advanced successional stage that has undergone minor disturbance. Those plants with high degrees of fidelity to a narrow range of synecological parameters were assigned a value of 9 to 10.

CW - Coefficient of Wetness: A wetness index which gives an indication of where plant species are typically found. Wetland values are between -5 and 5.

- 5: Occurs almost always in wetlands under natural conditions
- 4 to -2: Usually occurs in wetlands, but occasionally found in non-wetlands
- 1 to 1: Equally likely to occur in wetlands or non-wetlands
- 2 to 4: Occasionally occurs in wetlands, but usually occurs in non-wetlands
- 5: Occurs almost never in wetlands under natural conditions

MNR Global Rank

- G1 -- Extremely rare: < 5 occurrences
- G2 -- Very rare: 5-20 occurrences
- G3 -- Rare to uncommon: 20-100 occurrences
- G4 -- Common: >100 occurrences
- G5 -- Very common
- ? -- Follows a rank and denotes rank is tentatively assigned (i.e. G4?)
- G? -- Unranked
- T -- Denotes that the rank applies to a subspecies or variety

COSEWIC - Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada

REG - Regionally Rare Rank

- R - Native and Rare, based on 5 or fewer recent stations
- R1 - 1 recent station
- R2 - 2 recent stations
- R3 - 3 recent station
- R4 - 4 recent stations
- R5 - 5 recent stations
- Rn - Known only from HISTORIC (pre-1964) records
- VU - Native and Very Uncommon, based on 5 to 8 recent stations
- U - Native and Uncommon, based on 9 to 15 recent stations
- C - Native and Common, based on more than 15 recent stations

I - Introduced and persisting outside cultivation

Weed - Weediness Index: The Weediness Index qualifies the potential invasiveness of non-native plants, and, in combination with the percentage of non-native plants can be used as an indicator of disturbance. Values between -1 and -3 have been assigned to most non-native species based on the potential impact each species can have in a natural area.

- 1 little or no impact on natural areas
- 2 occasional impacts on natural areas; generally infrequent of localized
- 3 major potential impacts on natural areas

MNR Provincial Rank

- S1 -- Extremely rare in Ontario: < 5 occurrences
- S2 -- Very rare in Ontario: 5 - 20 occurrences
- S3 -- Rare to uncommon in Ontario: 20 - 100 occurrences
- S4 -- Common in Ontario: > 100 occurrences
- S5 -- Very common in Ontario
- SE -- Exotic
- ? -- Follows a rank and denotes rank is tentatively assigned (i.e. S4?)
- S? -- Unranked

Wetland Communities

- M - Marsh Community
- S - Swamp Community

EARTH TECH (CANADA) INC.
VASCULAR PLANT SPECIES LIST

Section 2 - Eastwood Non-PSW
924/22
Spring 2005/ Spring 2006

SITE:
EO:
DATE:

SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	FAMILY	CC	CW	GRANK	SRANK	WEED	COSEMIC	MNR	REG	SWT 2-9*	MAS 2-4*	MAS 2-1*	Willow Thicket**	Willow Thicket	deciduous	Ash/Poplar Swamp*	Forb Marsh**	Meadow Marsh**	Moss Marsh**		
mixed herbs																						
Arisaema triphyllum	Swamp Jack-in-the-pulpit	ARACEAE	5	-2	G5	S5					x											
Carex lacustris	Lake-bank Sedge	CYPERACEAE	5	-5	G5	S5																
Cornus sp.	Dogwood species	CORNACEAE																				
Cornus racemosa	Gray dogwood	CORNACEAE																				
Cornus stolonifera	Red-osier Dogwood	CORNACEAE	2	-3	G5	S5																
Fraxinus sp.	Ash species	OLEACEAE																				
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	Red Ash/Green Ash	OLEACEAE	3	-3	G5	S5																
Impatiens capensis	Spotted Jewel-weed	BALSAMINACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5																
Onoclea sensibilis	Sensitive Fern	DRYOPTERIDACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5																
Salix sp.	Willow species	SALICACEAE																				
Typha sp.	Cattail species	TYPHACEAE	3	-5	G5	S5																
Typha latifolia	Broad-leaf Cattail	TYPHACEAE																				
Ulmus sp.	Elm species	ULMIACEAE																				
Vibis sp.	Viburnum species	VITACEAE																				
Acer saccharinum	Silver Maple	ACERACEAE	5	-3	G5	S5																
Aster plantago-aquatica	Broad-leaved Water-plantain	ASTERACEAE	3	-3	G5	S5																
Asterionema canadensis	Canada Anemone	ANISMATACEAE	3	-3	G5	S5																
Carex crinita	Fringed Sedge	CYPERACEAE	6	-4	G5	S5																
Lemna minor	Duck weed																					
Carex pseudo-cyperus	Cyperus-like Sedge	CYPERACEAE	6	-5	G5	S5																
Carex sp.	Sedge species	CYPERACEAE																				
Cornus alternifolia	Alternate-leaf Dogwood	CORNACEAE	6	5	G5	S5																
Daucus carota	Wild Carrot	APIACEAE	5	-5	G7	SE5	-2															
Iris versicolor	Blueflag	IRIDACEAE	5	-4	G5	S5																
Phalaris arundinacea	Reed Canary Grass	POACEAE	0	-4	G5	S5																
Populus sp.	Poplar species	SALICACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5																
Ribes americanum	Wild Black Currant	GROSSULARIACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5																
Symblocarpus foetidus	Skunk Cabbage	ARACEAE	7	-5	G5	S5																
	Grass species	GRAMINEAE																				

*Note: Information taken from Eastwood Wetland Evaluation

Legend

CC - Coefficient of Conservatism: each native taxon is assigned a rank of 0 to 10 based on its degree of fidelity to a range of synecological parameters. Plants found in a wide variety of plant communities, including disturbed sites, were assigned ranks of 0 to 3. Plants that typically are associated with a specific plant community, but tolerate moderate disturbance, were assigned ranks of 4 to 6. Rankings of 7 to 8 were applied to those plants associated with a plant community in an advanced successional stage that has undergone minor disturbance. Those plants with high degrees of fidelity to a narrow range of synecological parameters were assigned a value of 9 to 10.

CW - Coefficient of Wetness: A wetness index which gives an indication of where plant species are typically found. Wetland values are between -5 and 5.

-5: Occurs almost always in wetlands under natural conditions

-4 to -2: Usually occurs in wetlands, but occasionally found in non-wetlands

-1 to 1: Equally likely to occur in wetlands or non-wetlands

2 to 4: Occasionally occurs in wetlands, but usually occurs in non-wetlands

5: Occurs almost never in wetlands under natural conditions

Weed - Weediness Index: The Weediness index qualifies the potential invasiveness of non-native plants, and, in combination with the percentages of non-native plants can be used as an indicator of disturbance. Values between -1 and -3 have been assigned to most non-native species based on the potential impact each species can have in a natural area.

-1 little or no impact on natural areas

-2 occasional impacts on natural areas, generally infrequent or localized

-3 major potential impacts on natural areas

MNR Global Rank

- G1 -- Extremely rare: < 5 occurrences
- G2 -- Very rare: 5-20 occurrences
- G3 -- Rare to uncommon: 20-100 occurrences
- G4 -- Common: > 100 occurrences
- G5 -- Very common
- ? -- Follows a rank and denotes rank is tentatively assigned (ie. G4?)
- G? -- Unranked
- T -- Denotes that the rank applies to a subspecies or variety

COSEWIC - Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada

REG - Regionally Rare Rank

- R - Native and Rare, based on 5 or fewer recent stations
- R1 - 1 recent station
- R2 - 2 recent stations
- R3 - 3 recent stations
- R4 - 4 recent stations
- R5 - 5 recent stations
- R6 - Known only from HISTORIC (pre-1964) records
- VU - Native and Very Uncommon, based on 5 to 8 recent stations
- U - Native and Uncommon, based on 9 to 15 recent stations
- C - Native and Common, based on more than 15 recent stations
- I - Introduced and persisting outside cultivation

MNR Provincial Rank

- S1 -- Extremely rare in Ontario: < 5 occurrences
- S2 -- Very rare in Ontario: 5 - 20 occurrences
- S3 -- Rare to uncommon in Ontario: 20 - 100 occurrences
- S4 -- Common in Ontario: > 100 occurrences
- S5 -- Very common in Ontario
- SE -- Exotic
- ? -- Follows a rank and denotes rank is tentatively assigned (ie. S4?)
- S? -- Unranked

Wetland Communities

- M - Marsh Community
- S - Swamp Community

EARTH TECH (CANADA) INC.
VASCULAR PLANT SPECIES LIST

SITE: Section 3 - BB2D Ngn-PSW
EO: 92422
DATE: Spring 2006

SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	FAMILY	CC	CW	GRANK	SRANK	WEED	COSEMIC	MNR	REG	MAM 3.2	MAM 3.2	MAS	SWT	SWT 2-9	SND	Open Water	CUT 1-4	CUT 1	CUT 3
<i>Acer negundo</i>	Box Elder	ACEERACEAE	0	-2	G5	S5					X									
<i>Acer saccharum</i>	Sugar Maple	ACEERACEAE	3	-3	G5	S5														
<i>Achillea millefolium</i>	Yarrow	ASTERICACEAE	4	3	G5	S5														
<i>Alliaria petiolata</i>	Garlic Mustard	BRASSICACEAE	3	0	G7	SE5	-1													
<i>Anemone neglecta</i>	Field Pussytoes	ASTERICACEAE	3	5	G5	S5	-3													
<i>Arisaema triphyllum</i>	Swamp Jack-in-the-pulpit	ARACEAE	5	-2	G5	S5														
<i>Carex</i> sp.	Sedge species	CYPERACEAE	5	-2	G5	S5														
<i>Cornus racemosa</i>	Gray Dogwood	CORNACEAE	2	-3	G5	S5														
<i>Cornus stolonifera</i>	Dogwood species	CORNACEAE	2	-3	G5	S5														
<i>Cornus stolonifera</i>	Red-osier Dogwood	CORNACEAE	3	5	G5	SE5	-1													
<i>Cypripedium acaule</i>	White-flowered Cypripedium	ORCHIDACEAE	7	-1	G5	S5														
<i>Cypripedium pubescens</i>	Yellow Cypripedium	ORCHIDACEAE	8	-3	G5	S5														
<i>Equisetum</i> sp.	Horsetail	EQUISETACEAE	6	5	G5	S5														
<i>Erythronium americanum</i>	Yellow Trout-lily	LILIACEAE	5	5	G5	S5														
<i>Eunonymus albosinensis</i>	Running Strawberry-bush	CELASTRACEAE	6	5	G5	S5														
<i>Fragaria virginiana</i>	Wild Strawberry	ROSACEAE	2	1	G5	S5														
<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	White Ash	OLEACEAE	4	3	G5	S5														
<i>Fraxinus sp.</i>	Strawberry species	ROSACEAE	4	3	G5	S5														
<i>Fraxinus sp.</i>	Ash species	OLEACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5														
<i>Impatiens capensis</i>	Spotted Jewelweed	BALANINACEAE	5	-3	G5	S5														
<i>Impatiens sp.</i>	Jewelweed	BALANINACEAE	5	-3	G5	S5														
<i>Thalictrum flavum</i>	Bluish Thalictrum	FRINGILLACEAE	5	-3	G5	S5														
<i>Thalictrum sp.</i>	Thalictrum species	FRINGILLACEAE	5	-3	G5	S5														
<i>Mentha</i> sp.	Mint species	LAMIACEAE	5	5	G5	SE5	-1													
<i>Onoclea sensibilis</i>	Sensitive Fern	DRYOPTERIDACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5														
<i>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</i>	Virginia Creeper	VITACEAE	6	1	G5	S4														
<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	Reed Canary Grass	POACEAE	0	-4	G5	S5														
<i>Pinus</i> sp.	Pine species	POACEAE	0	-4	G5	S5														
<i>Potamogeton</i> sp.	Potamogeton species	POTAMOGETONACEAE	3	3	G5	S5														
<i>Prunus serotina</i>	Wild Black Cherry	ROSACEAE	2	1	G5	S5														
<i>Prunus virginiana</i>	Choke Cherry	ROSACEAE	2	1	G5	S5														
<i>Rhamnus cathartica</i>	Buckthorn	RHAMNACEAE	0	-2	G5	S5														
<i>Rubus idaeus</i>	Shimron Red Raspberry	ROSACEAE	0	-2	G5	S5														
<i>Rubus sp.</i>	Rubus species	ROSACEAE	0	-2	G5	S5														
<i>Sambucus canadensis</i>	Common Elderberry	SAMBUCACEAE	5	-2	G5	S5														
<i>Solidago</i> sp.	Goldenrod species	ASTERICACEAE	5	-2	G5	S5														
<i>Taxodium officinale</i>	Swamp-cypress	TAXODIACEAE	3	3	G5	S5	-2													
<i>Trientalis americana</i>	American Bloodroot	TIENTALIACEAE	4	3	G5	S5														
<i>Trifolium</i> sp.	Clover species	FABACEAE	4	3	G5	S5														
<i>Trifolium sp.</i>	Trifolium species	FABACEAE	4	3	G5	S5														
<i>Typha</i> sp.	Cattail species	TYPHACEAE	3	-2	G5	S5														
<i>Ulmus americana</i>	American Elm	ULMACEAE	5	-5	G4G5	S5														
<i>Viola cucullata</i>	Moran Blue Violet	VIOLACEAE	3	-5	G4G5	S5														
<i>Vitis</i> sp.	Grape species	VITACEAE	3	-5	G4G5	S5														

Legend

CC - Coefficient of Conservatism: each native taxon is assigned a rank of 0 to 10 based on its degree of fidelity to a range of synecological parameters. Plants found in a wide variety of plant communities, including disturbed sites, were assigned ranks of 0 to 3. Plants that typically are associated with a specific plant community, but tolerate moderate disturbance, were assigned ranks of 4 to 6. Rankings of 7 to 8 were applied to those plants associated with a plant community in an advanced successional stage that has undergone minor disturbance. Those plants with high degrees of fidelity to a narrow range of synecological parameters were assigned a value of 9 to 10.

CW - Coefficient of Wetness: A wetness index which gives an indication of where plant species are typically found. Wetland values are between -5 and 5.
-5: Occurs almost always in wetlands under natural conditions
-4 to -2: Usually occurs in wetlands, but occasionally found in non-wetlands
-1 to 1: Equally likely to occur in wetlands or non-wetlands
2 to 4: Occasionally occurs in wetlands, but usually occurs in non-wetlands
5: Occurs almost never in wetlands under natural conditions

Weed - Weedness Index: The Weedness Index qualifies the potential invasiveness of non-native plants, and, in combination with the percentage of non-native plants can be used as an indicator of disturbance. Values between -1 and -3 have been assigned to most non-native species based on the potential impact each species can have in a natural area.
-1 little or no impact on natural areas
-2 occasional impacts on natural areas, generally infrequent or localized
-3 major potential impacts on natural areas

MNR Global Rank

- G1 -- Extremely rare; < 5 occurrences
- G2 -- Very rare; 5-20 occurrences
- G3 -- Rare to uncommon; 20-100 occurrences
- G4 -- Common; > 100 occurrences
- G5 -- Very common
- ? -- Follows a rank and denotes rank is tentatively assigned (ie. G4?)
- G? -- Unranked
- T -- Denotes that the rank applies to a subspecies or variety

COSEWIC - Committees on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada

REG - Regionally Rare Rank

- R - Native and Rare, based on 5 or fewer recent stations
- R1 - 1 recent station
- R2 - 2 recent stations
- R3 - 3 recent stations
- R4 - 4 recent stations
- R5 - 5 recent stations
- Rn - known only from HISTORIC (pre-1964) records
- VU - Native and Very Uncommon, based on 5 to 8 recent stations
- U - Native and Uncommon, based on 9 to 15 recent stations
- C - Native and Common, based on more than 15 recent stations
- I - Introduced and persisting outside colonization

MNR Provincial Rank

- S1 -- Extremely rare in Ontario; < 5 occurrences
- S2 -- Very rare in Ontario; 5 - 20 occurrences
- S3 -- Rare to uncommon in Ontario; 20 - 100 occurrences
- S4 -- Common in Ontario; > 100 occurrences
- SE -- Exotic
- ? -- Follows a rank and denotes rank is tentatively assigned (ie. S4?)
- S? -- Unranked

Wetland Communities

- M - Marsh Community
- S - Swamp Community

EARTH TECH (CANADA) INC.
VASCULAR PLANT SPECIES LIST

SITE: Section 4 - UTRCA Lands
EO: 92422
DATE: Summer 2006

SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	FAMILY	CC	CW	GRANK	SRANK	WEED	COSEWIC	MNR	REG	CUP 3-3	CUP 1-3	FOD 5-7	FOD 8-1	MAM 2-6	MAM 2 / CUM 1-1	MAS 2
<i>Acer saccharum</i> ssp. <i>saccharum</i>	Sugar Maple	ACERACEAE	4	3	G5?	S5											
<i>Allium birdii</i>	Narrow-leaved Wild Leek	LILIACEAE	9	3	G4G5	S1?				R2							
<i>Carex lacustris</i>	Lake-bank Sedge	CYPERACEAE	5	-5	G5	S5											
<i>Carya cordiformis</i>	Bitternut Hickory	JUGLANDACEAE	6	0	G5	S5											
<i>Erythronium americanum</i>	Yellow Trout-lily	LILIACEAE	5	5	G5	S5											
<i>Fagus grandifolia</i>	American Beech	FAGACEAE	6	3	G5	S5											
<i>Fraxinus</i> sp.	Ash species	OLEACEAE	5	3	G5	S4											
<i>Juglans nigra</i>	Black Walnut	JUGLANDACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5											
<i>Onoclea sensibilis</i>	Sensitive Fern	DRYOPTERIDACEAE	5	3	G5	S5											
<i>Podophyllum peltatum</i>	May Apple	BERBERIDACEAE	2	0	G5	S5											
<i>Populus tremuloides</i>	Quaking Aspen	SALICACEAE	3	3	G5	S5											
<i>Populus serotina</i>	Wild Black Cherry	ROSACEAE	3	3	G5	S5											
<i>Rhamnus cathartica</i>	Buckthorn	RHAMNACEAE	3	G?	SE5	-3											
<i>Salix</i> sp.	Willow species	SALICACEAE	5	4	G5	S5											
<i>Sanguinaria canadensis</i>	Bloodroot	PAPAVERACEAE	3	-5	G5	S5											
<i>Sonchus</i>	Goldenrod sp.	ASTERACEAE	3	-5	G5	S5											
<i>Typha latifolia</i>	Broad-leaf Cattail	TYPHACEAE	3	-5	G5	S5											
<i>Alisma plantago-aquatica</i>	Broadleaved Water-plantain	ALISMATACEAE	3	-3	G5	S5											
<i>Anemone canadensis</i>	Canada Anemone	RANUNCULACEAE	0	5	G5	S5											
<i>Asclepias syriaca</i>	Kansas Milkweed	ASCLEPADACEAE	4	-5	G5	S5											
<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>	Blue-joint Reedgrass	POACEAE	3	-5	G5	S5											
<i>Carex</i> sp.	Sedge species	CYPERACEAE	3	-5	G5	S5											
<i>Carex stipata</i>	Stalk-grain Sedge	CYPERACEAE	1	-3	G5	S5											
<i>Eriogon philadelphicus</i>	Philadelphia Fleabane	ASTERACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5											
<i>Lemna</i> sp.	Duckweed species	LEMNACEAE	5	G?	SE5	-3											
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	Scotch Pine	PINACEAE	6	-5	G5	S5											
<i>Ribes americanum</i>	Wild Black Currant	GROSSULARIACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5											
<i>Ribes triste</i>	Swamp Red Currant	GROSSULARIACEAE	7	-5	G5	S5											
<i>Symplocarpus foetidus</i>	Skunk Cabbage	ARACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5											
<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	Northern White Cedar	CUPRESSACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5											
<i>Tilia americana</i>	American Basswood	TILIACEAE	4	3	G5	S5											
<i>Typha angustifolia</i>	Narrow-leaved Cattail	TYPHACEAE	3	-5	G5	S5											

Legend

CC - Coefficient of Conservatism: each native taxon is assigned a rank of 0 to 10 based on its degree of fidelity to a range of synecological parameters. Plants found in a wide variety of plant communities, including disturbed sites, were assigned ranks of 0 to 3. Plants that typically are associated with a specific plant community, but tolerate moderate disturbance, were assigned ranks of 4 to 6. Rankings of 7 to 8 were applied to those plants associated with a plant community in an advanced successional stage that has undergone minor disturbance. Those plants with high degrees of fidelity to a narrow range of synecological parameters were assigned a value of 9 to 10.

CW - Coefficient of Wetness: A wetness index which gives an indication of where plant species are typically found. Wetland values are between -5 and 5.

- 5: Occurs almost always in wetlands under natural conditions
- 4 to -2: Usually occurs in wetlands, but occasionally found in non-wetlands
- 1 to 1: Equally likely to occur in wetlands or non-wetlands
- 2 to 4: Occasionally occurs in wetlands, but usually occurs in non-wetlands
- 5: Occurs almost never in wetlands under natural conditions

Weed - Weediness Index: The Weediness Index qualifies the potential invasiveness of non-native plants, and, in combination with the percentage of non-native plants can be used as an indicator of disturbance. Values between -1 and -3 have been assigned to most non-native species based on the potential impact each species can have in a natural area.

- 1 little or no impact on natural areas
- 2 occasional impacts on natural areas, generally infrequent or localized
- 3 major potential impacts on natural areas

MNR Global Rank

- G1 -- Extremely rare; < 5 occurrences
- G2 -- Very rare; 5-20 occurrences
- G3 -- Rare to uncommon; 20-100 occurrences
- G4 -- Common; >100 occurrences
- G5 -- Very common
- ? -- Follows a rank and denotes rank is tentatively assigned (ie. G4?)
- G? -- Unranked
- T -- Denotes that the rank applies to a subspecies or variety

COSEWIC - Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada

REG - Regionally Rare Rank

- R - Native and Rare, based on 5 or fewer recent stations
- R1 - 1 recent station
- R2 - 2 recent stations
- R3 - 3 recent stations
- R4 - 4 recent stations
- R5 - 5 recent stations
- Rh - known only from HISTORIC (pre-1964) records
- VU - Native and Very Uncommon, based on 5 to 8 recent stations
- U - Native and Uncommon, based on 9 to 15 recent stations
- C - Native and Common, based on more than 15 recent stations
- I - Introduced and persisting outside cultivation

MNR Provincial Rank

- S1 -- Extremely rare in Ontario; < 5 occurrences
- S2 -- Very rare in Ontario; 5 - 20 occurrences
- S3 -- Rare to uncommon in Ontario; 20 - 100 occurrences
- S4 -- Common in Ontario; > 100 occurrences
- S5 -- Very common in Ontario
- SE -- Exotic
- ? -- Follows a rank and denotes rank is tentatively assigned (ie. S4?)
- S? -- Unranked

Wetland Communities

- M - Marsh Community
- S - Swamp Community

EARTH TECH (CANADA) INC.
VASCULAR PLANT SPECIES LIST

SITE: Section 5 - Miscellaneous Patches East of 401
EO: 92422
DATE: Summer 2006

SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	FAMILY	CC	CW	GRANK	SRANK	WEED	COSEMIC	MNR	REG	CUP 3-2	POD 8-1	CUV 1	CUM 1-1	POD 6-5	SWD 3-2	POD 5-2	POD 5-7
Acer negundo	Box Elder	ACEPAGACEAE	0	2	G5	S5					x							
Acer rubrum	Red Maple	ACEPAGACEAE	4	0	G5	S5												
Acer saccharinum	Silver Maple	ACEPAGACEAE	4	0	G5	S5												
Acer saccharum ssp. saccharum	Sugar Maple	ACEPAGACEAE	5	3	G5	S5												
Achillea millefolium ssp. millefolium	Yarrow	ASTERACEAE	4	3	G5T7	S5	-1											
Actaea rubra	Red Baneberry	RANUNCULACEAE	5	3	G5	S5												
Agropyron sp.	Agropyron	POACEAE	3	-3	G5	S5												
Abrus precatorius	Canada Poison	RANUNCULACEAE	7	3	G5	S4												
Arisaema triphyllum	Swamp Jack-in-the-pulpit	ARISAEACEAE	4	-5	G5	S5												
Arundo donax	Common Reed	POACEAE	4	-5	G5	S5												
Asplenium platyneuron	False Nettle	URTICACEAE	4	-5	G5	S5												
Betula pumila	Marsh Marigold	RANUNCULACEAE	6	0	G5	S5												
Betula sp.	American Hornbeam	BETULACEAE	6	0	G5	S5												
Carolinus caroliniana	Bitter-nut Hickory	JUGLANDACEAE	6	0	G5	S5												
Carya cordiformis	Shag-bark Hickory	JUGLANDACEAE	6	3	G5	S5												
Carya ovata	Chicory	ASTERACEAE	5	5	G7	SE5	-1											
Cochlearia officinalis	Small Enchanter's Nightshade	ONAGRACEAE	6	-3	G5	S5												
Cirsium alpinum	Stiff Dogwood	CORNACEAE	2	-2	G5	S5												
Cornus foemina	A Hawthorn	ROSACEAE	4	-2	G5	S5												
Crataegus mollis	Dotted Hawthorn	ROSACEAE	4	5	G5	S5												
Crataegus punctata	Hawthorn species	ROSACEAE	4	5	G5	S5												
Crataegus sp.	Wild Carrot	APIACEAE	5	5	G7	SE5	-2											
Daucus carota	American Beech	FAGACEAE	6	3	G5	S5												
Fagus grandifolia	Virginia Strawberry	ROSACEAE	2	1	G5	S5												
Fragaria virginiana	White Ash	OLEACEAE	4	3	G5	S5												
Fraxinus americana	Red Ash/Green Ash	POACEAE	4	3	G5	SE2												
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	Yellow Avens	ROSACEAE	2	-1	G5	S5												
Geum aleppicum	Corn Mint	LAMIACEAE	3	-3	G5	S5												
Mentha arvensis	Canada Clearweed	URTICACEAE	5	-3	G5	S5												
Pilea pumila	Jack Pine	PINACEAE	9	3	G5	S5												
Pinus banksiana	Eastern White Pine	PINACEAE	4	3	G5	S5												
Pinus strobus	Scotch Pine	PINACEAE	4	3	G5	S5												
Pinus sylvestris	May Apple	BERBERIDACEAE	5	3	G5	S5												
Podophyllum peltatum	Eastern Cottonwood	SALICACEAE	4	-1	G5	S5												
Populus deltoides	Quaking Aspen	SALICACEAE	2	0	G5	S5												
Populus tremuloides	Wild Black Cherry	ROSACEAE	3	3	G5	S5												
Prunus serotina	Staghorn Sumac	ANACARDIACEAE	1	5	G5	S5												
Rhus typhina	Canada Goldenrod	ASTERACEAE	1	3	G5	S5												
Solidago canadensis	Common Lilac	OLEACEAE	5	5	G7	SE5	-2											
Syringa vulgaris	Brown-seed Dandelion	ASTERACEAE	3	5	SE5	-2												
Taraxacum officinale	American Basswood	TILIACEAE	4	3	G5	S5												
Tilia americana	Red Clover	FABACEAE	2	G7	SE5	-2												
Trifolium pratense	White Clover	FABACEAE	2	G7	SE5	-1												
Trifolium repens	American Elm	ULMACEAE	3	-2	G5?	S5												
Ulmus americana	Tulfed Vetch	FABACEAE	3	5	G7	SE5	-1											
Vicia cracca	Riverbank Grape	VITACEAE	0	-2	G5	S5												
Vitis riparia																		

CC - Coefficient of Conservatism: each native taxon is assigned a rank of 0 to 10 based on its degree of fidelity to a range of synecological parameters. Plants found in a wide variety of plant communities, including disturbed sites, were assigned ranks of 0 to 3. Plants that typically are associated with a specific plant community, but tolerate moderate disturbance, were assigned ranks of 4 to 6. Rankings of 7 to 8 were applied to those plants associated with a plant community in an advanced successional stage that has undergone minor disturbance. Those plants with high degrees of fidelity to a narrow range of synecological parameters were assigned a value of 9 to 10.

CW - Coefficient of Wetness: A wetness index which gives an indication of where plant species are typically found. Wetland values are between -5 and 5.

- 5: Occurs almost always in wetlands under natural conditions
- 4 to -2: Usually occurs in wetlands, but occasionally found in non-wetlands
- 1 to 1: Equally likely to occur in wetlands or non-wetlands
- 2 to 4: Occasionally occurs in wetlands, but usually occurs in non-wetlands
- 5: Occurs almost never in wetlands under natural conditions

MNR Global Rank

- G1 -- Extremely rare: < 5 occurrences
- G2 -- Very rare: 5-20 occurrences
- G3 -- Rare to uncommon: 20-100 occurrences
- G4 -- Common: >100 occurrences
- G5 -- Very common
- ? -- Follows a rank and denotes rank is tentatively assigned (ie. G4?)
- G? -- Unranked
- T -- Denotes that the rank applies to a subspecies or variety

COSEWIC - Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada

REG - Regionally Rare Rank

- R - Native and Rare, based on 5 or fewer recent stations
- R1 - 1 recent station
- R2 - 2 recent stations
- R3 - 3 recent stations
- R4 - 4 recent stations
- R5 - 5 recent stations

Rh - Known only from HISTORIC (pre-1984) records

VU - Native and Very Uncommon, based on 5 to 8 recent stations

U - Native and Uncommon, based on 9 to 15 recent stations

C - Native and Common, based on more than 15 recent stations I - Introduced and persisting outside cultivation

Weed - Weediness Index: The Weediness Index qualifies the potential invasiveness of non-native plants, and, in combination with the percentage of non-native plants can be used as an indicator of disturbance. Values between -1 and -3 have been assigned to most non-native species based on the potential impact each species can have in a natural area.

- 1 little or no impact on natural areas
- 2 occasional impacts on natural areas, generally infrequent or localized
- 3 major potential impacts on natural areas

MNR Provincial Rank

- S1 -- Extremely rare in Ontario: < 5 occurrences
- S2 -- Very rare in Ontario: 5 - 20 occurrences
- S3 -- Rare to uncommon in Ontario: 20 - 100 occurrences
- S4 -- Common in Ontario: > 100 occurrences
- S5 -- Very common in Ontario
- SE -- Exotic
- ? -- Follows a rank and denotes rank is tentatively assigned (ie. S4?)
- S? -- Unranked

Wetland Communities

M - Marsh Community

S - Swamp Community

EARTH TECH (CANADA) INC.
VASCULAR PLANT SPECIES LIST

SITE: Section 6 - Miscellaneous Patches west of 401
EO: 92422
DATE: Summer 2006

SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME	FAMILY	CC	CW	GRANK	SRANK	WEED	COSEWIC	MNR	REG	FORM 3-2	CUP 3-2	CUP 1-3
<i>Acer saccharum</i> ssp. <i>saccharum</i>	Sugar Maple	ACERACEAE	4	3	G5?	S5				x			
<i>Allium tricoccum</i>	Small White Leek	LILIACEAE	7	2	G5	S5				x			
<i>Juglans nigra</i>	Black Walnut	JUGLANDACEAE	5	3	G5	S4						x	
<i>Onoclea sensibilis</i>	Sensitive Fern	DRYOPTERIDACEAE	4	-3	G5	S5				x			
<i>Rubus fruticosus</i> spp.	Blackberry	ROSACEAE	0	-2	G5	S5						x	
<i>Rubus idaeus</i>	Common Red Raspberry	ROSACEAE	0	-2	G5	S5						x	
<i>Vitis</i> sp.	Grape species	VITACEAE	4	3	G5	S5					x		
<i>Carex</i> sp.	Sedge species	CYPERACEAE	4	3	G5	S5						x	
<i>Pinus strobus</i>	Eastern White Pine	PINACEAE	4	3	G5	S5							x
<i>Trillium</i> sp.	Trillium sp.	PINACEAE	4	3	G5	S5							x
<i>Tsuga canadensis</i>	Eastern Hemlock	PINACEAE	7	3	G5	S5							x
<i>Vincetoxicum</i>	Periwinkle	APCYNACEAE	7	5	G?	SE5	-2						x

Legend

CC - Coefficient of Conservatism: each native taxon is assigned a rank of 0 to 10 based on its degree of fidelity to a range of synecological parameters. Plants found in a wide variety of plant communities, including disturbed sites, were assigned ranks of 0 to 3. Plants that typically are associated with a specific plant community, but tolerate moderated disturbance, were assigned ranks of 4 to 6. Rankings of 7 to 8 were applied to those plants associated with a plant community in an advanced successional stage that has undergone minor disturbance. Those plants with high degrees of fidelity to a narrow range of synecological parameters were assigned a value of 9 to 10.

CW - Coefficient of Wetness: A wetness index which gives an indication of where plant species are typically found. Wetland values are between -5 and 5.

- 5: Occurs almost always in wetlands under natural conditions
- 4 to -2: Usually occurs in wetlands, but occasionally found in non-wetlands
- 1 to 1: Equally likely to occur in wetlands or non-wetlands
- 2 to 4: Occasionally occurs in wetlands, but usually occurs in non-wetlands
- 5: Occurs almost never in wetlands under natural conditions

MNR Global Rank

- G1 -- Extremely rare; < 5 occurrences
- G2 -- Very rare; 5-20 occurrences
- G3 -- Rare to uncommon; 20-100 occurrences
- G4 -- Common; > 100 occurrences
- G5 -- Very common
- ? .. Follows a rank and denotes rank is tentatively assigned (ie. G4?)
- G? -- Unranked
- T -- Denotes that the rank applies to a subspecies or variety

COSEWIC - Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada

Weed - Weediness Index: The Weediness index qualifies the potential invasiveness of non-native plants, and, in combination with the percentage of non-native plants can be used as an indicator of disturbance. Values between -1 and -3 have been assigned to most non-native species based on the potential impact each species can have in a natural area.

- 1 little or no impact on natural areas
- 2 occasional impacts on natural areas, generally infrequent or localized
- 3 major potential impacts on natural areas

MNR Provincial Rank

- S1 -- Extremely rare in Ontario; < 5 occurrences
- S2 -- Very rare in Ontario; 5 - 20 occurrences
- S3 -- Rare to uncommon in Ontario; 20 - 100 occurrences
- S4 -- Common in Ontario; > 100 occurrences
- S5 -- Very common in Ontario
- SE -- Exotic
- ? .. Follows a rank and denotes rank is tentatively assigned (ie. S4?)
- S? -- Unranked

REG - Regionally Rare Rank

R - Native and Rare, based on 5 or fewer recent stations

R1 - 1 recent station

R2 - 2 recent stations

R3 - 3 recent stations

R4 - 4 recent stations

R5 - 5 recent stations

Rh - known only from HISTORIC (pre-1964) records

VU - Native and Very Uncommon, based on 5 to 8 recent stations

U - Native and Uncommon, based on 9 to 15 recent stations

C - Native and Common, based on more than 15 recent stations | - introduced and persisting outside cultivation

APPENDIX “C”

EIS CHECKLIST FOR OXFORD COUNTY

Environmental Impact Study Scoping Checklist

In accordance with the requirements of the County of Oxford's Official Plan (Section 3.2.6.3)

Requirement	Description of Task	Required??		
		Yes	No	N/A
A. Scoping of Environmental Impact Study	i) Consultation with appropriate County/Provincial guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Consultation with the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority, City/County Planning Department and Ministry of Natural Resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Obtained County approval of Terms of Reference prior to undertaking EIS study?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. A description of the proposal and of the existing natural environment that will be affected or that might reasonably be affected, either directly or indirectly.	i) Description of proposed development provided?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Background review of existing documentation applicable to study area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Description of physical characteristics of the site (i.e. terrain, drainage, geology, soils)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Description of groundwater pathways/upwellings/highwater table?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	v) Vegetation communities delineated according to Ecological Land Classification (ELC) guidelines (Lee et al, 1998)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	vi) Vegetation surveys conducted at appropriate time of season?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	vii) Vegetation surveys capture adequate species composition of each ELC unit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	viii) Aquatic Habitat Assessment of surface water features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ix) Fish species surveys using appropriate capture methods (i.e. electro-shock, netting, trapping)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	x) Bird species surveys using appropriate methods?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	xi) Amphibian surveys using Great Lakes Marsh Monitoring Program or other suitable methods?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	xii) Reptile surveys?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	xiii) Butterfly/other insect surveys completed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	xiv) Mammal surveys?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EIS Checklist cont'd...

Requirement	Description of Task	Required??		
		Yes	No	N/A
C. Definition of the geographic area to be included in the study.	i) Does the study area include enough geographic area to assess the potential impacts of the proposed development?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. The environmental effects that might reasonably be expected to occur including any potential for groundwater or surface water degradation.	i) Assessment of Significance of existing natural features completed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Assessment of potential impacts of proposed development completed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. A recommendation as to whether the development should be permitted as proposed or whether alternatives to the proposed development should be considered.	i) Assessment of ability to develop	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Alternative methods and measures for mitigation of potential negative effects of the proposed development.	i) Mitigation measures address potential impacts (i.e. compensation/restoration areas, buffers)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G. Identification of measures to achieve a net environmental gain for fisheries resources and recommendations as to how such measures can be incorporated into the proposed development.	i) A net gain for fisheries resources demonstrated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
H. A monitoring plan to measure the potential effects on the environment.	i) Monitoring plan developed for the study area or surrounding area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Additional Comments: