



**NORTHLAND  
POWER**

# Martin's Meadows Solar Project

## Draft Natural Heritage Evaluation of Significance Report

April 27, 2012



Northland Power Inc.  
on behalf of  
Northland Power Solar  
Martin's Meadows L.P.  
Toronto, Ontario

DRAFT Natural Heritage  
Evaluation of Significance Report

Martin's Meadows Solar Project

H334844-0000-07-124-0321  
Rev. 0  
April 27, 2012

**Disclaimer**

This report has been prepared solely for the use of Northland Power Inc., who is submitting this document to the Ministry of the Environment as part of the Renewable Energy Approval process. This document is in DRAFT form and subject to further revision. The content of this document is not intended for the use of, nor is it intended to be relied upon by any person, firm or corporation.

Project Report

April 27, 2012

**Northland Power Inc.  
Martin's Meadows Solar Project**

**DRAFT Natural Heritage Evaluation of Significance**

**Table of Contents**

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Project Description .....	3
1.2 Legislative Requirements.....	3
1.2.1 Records Review Report .....	4
1.2.2 Site Investigation Report .....	4
1.2.3 Evaluation of Significance Report .....	4
1.3 Input to Evaluation of Significance from Consultation Activities .....	11
1.3.1 Public Consultation .....	11
1.3.2 Aboriginal Consultation.....	11
1.3.3 Municipal/Local Authority Consultation .....	11
1.4 Evaluation of Significance Report Format .....	11
<b>2. Summary of Results of Records Review and Site Investigation.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3. Wildlife Habitat .....</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1 Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines for Wildlife Habitat, and Determination of Significance .....	14
3.1.1 Solar Panel Project Location .....	14
3.1.1.1 Seasonal Concentration Areas.....	14
3.1.1.2 Specialized Wildlife Habitat .....	15
3.1.1.3 Habitat for species of conservation concern.....	21
3.1.1.4 Animal Movement Corridors .....	22
3.1.2 Distribution Line Project Location .....	23
3.2 Date of Beginning and Completion of Evaluation .....	24
3.3 Overall Conclusion .....	24
3.4 Name and Qualifications of Evaluator .....	25
<b>4. Wetlands .....</b>	<b>26</b>
4.1 Solar Panel Project Location .....	26
4.2 Distribution Line Project Location .....	26
<b>5. Conclusions.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>6. References.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Appendix A Natural Resource Solutions Inc., Wetland Evaluations</b>	

## List of Tables

Table 2.1	Natural Features on and within 120 m of the Project Location.....	12
Table 4.1	Wetland Characteristics and Ecological Functions of Wetlands within 120 m of the Distribution Line Project Location.....	27
Table 5.1	Significant Natural Features on and within 120 m of the Project Location.....	31

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1	Project Location and Significant Natural Heritage Features .....	5
Figure 1.2	Distribution Line Project Location (Eastern Half) – Generalized Candidate Significant Natural Heritage Features .....	7
Figure 1.3	Distribution Line Project Location (Western Half) – Generalized Candidate Significant Natural Heritage Features .....	9
Figure 3.1	Survey Locations .....	17

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Project Description

Northland Power Solar Martin's Meadows L.P. (hereinafter referred to as "Northland") is proposing to develop a Class 3 10-megawatt (MW) ground mounted solar photovoltaic (Solar PV) facility in the District of Cochrane. This Project, known as the Martin's Meadows Solar Project, is hereafter referred to as "Martin's Meadows" or the "Project."

The Project location is comprised of two primary components. The first part of the Project is the location of the solar panels, including access roads, inverters, transformers, fencing, etc, and is hereafter referred to as the "solar panel Project location". The solar panel Project location is approximately 82 hectares (ha) in size and located on Lot 16, Concession 8 of the Town of Cochrane. The solar panel Project location is situated on Glackmeyer Concession Road 9 (shown in Figure 1.1).

The second part of the Project is the approximately 20 km distribution line from the solar panel Project location to the connection point west of the Project location near Hunta, ON. This portion of the project is referred to as the distribution line Project location, with locations shown in Figures 1.2 and 1.3.

### 1.2 Legislative Requirements

Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 359/09 – *Renewable Energy Approvals Under Part V.0.1 of the Act*, made under the *Environmental Protection Act* identifies the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) requirements for renewable energy projects in Ontario. Ground-mounted solar facilities with a name plate capacity greater than 10 kilowatts (kW) are classified as Class 3 solar facilities and require a REA in accordance with Section 4 of O. Reg. 359/09.

Section 24(1) of O. Reg. 359/09 requires proponents of Class 3 solar projects to undertake a natural heritage assessment consisting of a records review report, site investigation report and an evaluation of significance report for each natural feature identified during the records review and site investigation.

Natural Features are defined in Section 1(1) of O. Reg. 359/09 to be all or part of

- a) an area of natural and scientific interest (ANSI) (earth science)
- b) an ANSI (life science)
- c) a coastal wetland
- d) a northern wetland
- e) a southern wetland
- f) a valleyland
- g) a wildlife habitat, or
- h) a woodland.

With respect to woodlands and valleylands, Section 1(1) of O. Reg. 359/09 requires that these features be located south and east of the Canadian Shield as shown in Figure 1 in the Provincial Policy Statement issued under Section 3 of the *Planning Act*. This figure shows that the proposed Project location is located on the Canadian Shield, and therefore valleylands and woodlands as defined by O. Reg. 359/09 cannot be located on the Project location.

### 1.2.1 *Records Review Report*

Section 25 of the REA Regulation requires proponents of Class 3 solar projects to undertake a natural heritage records review to identify “whether the project is

- (a) in a natural feature
- (b) within 50 m of an area of natural and scientific interest (earth science)
- (c) within 120 m of a natural feature that is not an area of natural or scientific interest (earth science).” (O. Reg. 359/09, s. 25, Table).

Subsection 2 of Section 30 of the REA Regulation requires the proponent to prepare a report “setting out a summary of the records searched and the results of the analysis” (O. Reg. 359/09). The Natural Heritage Records Review Report (Hatch Ltd., 2012a) was prepared to meet these requirements.

### 1.2.2 *Site Investigation Report*

Section 26 of the REA Regulation requires proponents of Class 3 solar projects to undertake a natural heritage site investigation for the purpose of determining

- whether the results of the analysis summarized in the (natural heritage records review) report prepared under Subsection 25(3) are correct or require correction, and identifying any required corrections
- whether any additional natural features exist, other than those that were identified in the (natural heritage records review) report prepared under Subsection 30(2)
- the boundaries, located within 120 m of the Project location, of any natural feature that was identified in the records review or the site investigation
- the distance from the Project location to the boundaries determined under clause (c).



The Natural Heritage Site Investigation Report (Hatch Ltd., 2012b) was prepared to meet these requirements.

### 1.2.3 *Evaluation of Significance Report*

Section 27 of the REA Regulation requires proponents of Class 3 solar projects to undertake an evaluation of significance (EOS) for natural heritage features identified during the records review and site investigation and prepare a report that sets out

- a determination of whether the natural feature is
  - ◆ provincially significant
  - ◆ significant





**LEGEND**

- Building
- - - Intermittent Watercourse
- Watercourse
- - - Project Location
- ▭ 120m from Project Location
- ▨ Significant Animal Movement Corridor
- ▨ Provincially Significant Wetland
- ▨ Significant Wetland Supporting Amphibian Breeding Habitat
- ▨ Adjoining Solar Facility

Notes:  
 1. Produced by Hatch under licence from Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Copyright (c) Queens Printer 2011.  
 2. Spatial referencing UTM NAD 83.  
 3. Satellite imagery obtained from Google Earth Pro, captured 2003.  
 4. Wetland information provided by NSRI (2011).






Figure 1.1  
 Northland Power Inc.  
**Martin's Meadows Solar Project**  
**Project Location and Significant Natural Heritage Features**  
**HATCH**



Blank back






**Legend**

- Road
- Utility Line
- Watercourse
- Area Sensitive Grassland Habitat / Short-eared Owl Habitat
- Area Sensitive Shrubland Habitat / *Carex Wiegandii* Habitat
- Area Sensitive Woodland / Canada Warbler / Olive-sided Flycatcher / *Vaccinium ovalifolium* Habitat
- Bald Eagle Habitat
- *Carex haydenii* Habitat
- *Carex loliacea* Habitat
- Common Nighthawk Habitat
- Old Growth or Mature Forest / Northern Long-eared Bat and Specialized Raptor Nesting Habitat
- Mink, Otter, Marten, and Fisher Denning Site
- Moose Aquatic Feeding Area
- Moose Late Winter Habitat / Winter Deer Yard
- *Scirpus heterochaetus* Habitat
- Seeps and Springs / *Carex tetanica* Habitat
- Red-necked Grebe Habitat
- Waterbody
- Waterfowl Stopover and Staging Area
- Waterfowl Nesting Habitat
- Wetland Area
- Wetlands Supporting Amphibian Breeding Ponds
- Project Infrastructure
- Connection Point
- Northland Power Project Location
- 120 m from Distribution Line

Notes:  
 1. Produced by Hatch under licence from Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Copyright (c) Queens Printer 2011.  
 2. Spatial referencing UTM NAD 83.  
 3. Satellite Imagery from Ministry of Natural Resources.





1:42,000

Figure 1.2  
 Northland Power Inc.  
**Distribution Line Project Location  
 (Eastern Half) - Generalized Candidate  
 Significant Natural Heritage Features**



[back](#)






**Legend**

- Road
- Utility Line
- Watercourse
- Area Sensitive Grassland Habitat / Short-eared Owl Habitat
- Area Sensitive Shrubland Habitat / *Carex Wiegandii* Habitat
- Area Sensitive Woodland / Canada Warbler / Olive-sided Flycatcher / *Vaccinium ovalifolium* Habitat
- ▨ Bald Eagle Habitat
- ▨ *Carex haydenii* Habitat
- ▨ *Carex loliacea* Habitat
- Common Nighthawk Habitat
- Old Growth or Mature Forest / Northern Long-eared Bat and Specialized Raptor Nesting Habitat
- ▨ Mink, Otter, Marten, and Fisher Denning Site
- ▨ Moose Aquatic Feeding Area
- ▨ Moose Late Winter Habitat / Winter Deer Yard
- ▨ *Scirpus heterochaetus* Habitat
- ▨ Seeps and Springs / *Carex tetanica* Habitat
- ▨ Red-necked Grebe Habitat
- Waterbody
- ▨ Waterfowl Stopover and Staging Area
- ▨ Waterfowl Nesting Habitat
- ▨ Wetland Area
- ▨ Wetlands Supporting Amphibian Breeding Ponds
- Connection Point
- ▭ Northland Power Project Location
- ▭ 120 m from Distribution Line

Notes:  
 1. Produced by Hatch under licence from Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Copyright (c) Queens Printer 2011.  
 2. Spatial referencing UTM NAD 83.  
 3. Satellite Imagery from Ministry of Natural Resources.



1:42,000

Figure 1.3  
 Northland Power Inc.  
**Distribution Line Project Location  
 (Western Half) - Generalized Candidate  
 Significant Natural Heritage Features**



- ◆ back of figure

- ◆ not significant
- ◆ not provincially significant
- a summary of the evaluation criteria or procedures used to make the determinations
- the name and qualifications of any person who applied to evaluation criteria or procedures.

This EOS Report for the natural features identified within 120 m of the Project has been prepared to meet these requirements.

### **1.3 Input to Evaluation of Significance from Consultation Activities**

As required by Section 27 of O.Reg. 359/09, the evaluation of significance must consider information obtained through consultation with the public, aboriginal communities and municipalities and local authorities. Results of these consultation activities in relation to the evaluation of significance are discussed below.

#### **1.3.1 Public Consultation**

A public meeting has been held in association with this Project; notices for the meeting were published in the local newspaper. In addition, landowners within 120 m of the Project location were mailed notices of the proposed Project and meeting dates.

To date, no information relating to natural features relevant to the evaluation of significance has been obtained through these consultation activities.

#### **1.3.2 Aboriginal Consultation**

Aboriginal communities identified by the Ministry of the Environment as communities to be consulted through the Renewable Energy Approval process have been mailed letters requesting information relating to the Project, along with meeting notices and copies of the Project Description Report.

To date, no information relating to natural features relevant to the evaluation of significance has been obtained through these consultation activities.

#### **1.3.3 Municipal/Local Authority Consultation**

Meetings have been held with staff of the Town of Cochrane and Hunta Local Roads Board. In addition, the Town and Roads Board have received notices of the public meetings and copies of the Project Description Report.

To date, no information relating to natural features relevant to the evaluation of significance has been obtained through these consultation activities.

### **1.4 Evaluation of Significance Report Format**

Section 1 of this EOS has identified the legislative requirements for an EOS under the REA Regulation and identified the reasons why an EOS is required for the Project. Section 2 provides a summary of the results of the records review and site investigation. Section 3 provides the EOS for wildlife habitat, and Section 4 provides the EOS for the wetland. Section 5 identifies the conclusions of the EOS, and the references are provided in Section 6.

## 2. Summary of Results of Records Review and Site Investigation

As stated above, natural features requiring an evaluation of significance are identified through the records review (Hatch Ltd., 2011a) and site investigation (Hatch Ltd., 2011b) required under Sections 25 and 26 of the REA Regulation, respectively. These studies have already been completed, and the results are summarized in Table 2.1. This Report provides the evaluations for the features identified in Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1 Natural Features on and within 120 m of the Project Location**

Natural Feature	Project Location	Adjacent Lands (within 120 m)
<i>Solar Panel Project Location</i>		
ANSI – Earth Science	No	No
ANSI – Life Science	No	No
Wetland	Yes	Yes
Wildlife Habitat	Yes	Yes
<i>Distribution Line Project Location</i>		
ANSI – Earth Science	No	No
ANSI – Life Science	No	No
Wetland	No	Yes
Wildlife Habitat	No	Yes

## 3. Wildlife Habitat

Several types of candidate significant wildlife habitats were identified during the site investigation:

- Solar Panel Project Location
  - ◆ Wetlands
  - ◆ Waterfowl Nesting habitat
  - ◆ Habitat for area-sensitive species
  - ◆ Wetlands supporting amphibian breeding habitat
  - ◆ Habitat for species of conservation concern, including
    - Common Nighthawk Habitat
    - Olive-sided Flycatcher Habitat
    - *Vaccinium ovalifolium* habitat
    - *Scirpus heterochaetus* habitat
    - *Carex wiegandii* habitat
    - *Carex haydenii* habitat
  - ◆ Animal movement corridor
- Distribution Line Project Location



- ◆ Generalized Characterized Candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat
  - Seasonal Concentration Areas
    - Winter deer yards/moose late winter habitat
    - Waterfowl stopover and staging areas
    - Waterfowl nesting sites
  - Specialized Wildlife Habitats
    - Area-sensitive woodland/shrubland/grassland habitats
    - Moose aquatic feeding areas
    - Old growth or mature forest stands
    - Woodlands supporting amphibian breeding habitat
    - Wetlands supporting amphibian breeding habitat
    - Mink, otter, marten and fisher denning sites
    - Specialized raptor nesting habitat
    - Seeps and springs
  - Habitat for Species of Conservation Concern
    - Northern Long-eared Bat
    - Red-necked Grebe
    - Short-eared Owl
    - Common Nighthawk
    - Canada Warbler
    - Bald Eagle
    - Olive-Sided Flycatcher
    - *Vaccinium ovalifolium*
    - *Scirpus heterochaetus*
    - *Carex wiegandii*
    - *Carex tetanica*
    - *Carex loliacea*
    - *Carex haydenii*
  - Animal Movement Corridors associated with several waterbodies within 120 m of the Project location

### 3.1 Evaluation Criteria and Guidelines for Wildlife Habitat, and Determination of Significance

The criteria processes outlined in the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) Natural Heritage Assessment Guide (NHAG) (MNR, 2011) and Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide (SWHTG) (MNR, 2000) are used to evaluate the significance of wildlife habitat. The specific criteria used in the evaluation from these sources are discussed by habitat type below.

#### 3.1.1 Solar Panel Project Location

##### 3.1.1.1 Seasonal Concentration Areas

###### 3.1.1.1.1 Waterfowl Nesting Habitat

Waterfowl Nesting Habitat was identified in associated with the habitats around Munroe Creek, which is crossed by an overhead connection line and access road to an adjoining solar project. In addition, portions of this habitat are also located on and within 120 m of the solar panels.

In order to evaluate the significance of waterfowl nesting habitat found along the creek, area searches were completed along the riparian habitat to search for evidence of nesting waterfowl (i.e., flushing from nest, waterfowl within creek, etc). Surveys were completed twice during the waterfowl breeding season, the first occurring during the pair establishment/nest initiation phase in mid May, and the second during the nesting phase in late June. Surveys were completed within the boundaries of the habitat as depicted in Figure 1.1. Details of the surveys are provided below:

- Site Investigation 1
  - ◆ Date, Times and Duration of Site Investigation
    - Date: May 18, 2011
    - Start Time: 1330
    - End Time: 1730
    - Duration: 4 hours
  - ◆ Weather Conditions During Site Investigation
    - Temperature: 18°C
    - Cloud Cover: Partly cloudy
  - ◆ Name and Qualifications of Person Conducting Site Investigation
    - This site investigation was completed by Levi Snook and Norm Bolton. Their qualifications are provided below.
      - Levi Snook is an Environmental Scientist with experience conducting environmental assessments on proposed hydroelectric, wind, and solar energy sites. He has diplomas in environmental science from Sir Sandford Fleming College and a degree in biology from Trent University. He has expertise in terrestrial assessments in support of Natural Heritage studies that include conducting Ecological Land

Classifications, as well as wildlife inventories, including amphibian and reptile surveys.

- o Norm Bolton is a Fish and Wildlife Technologist with 5 years experience of multi disciplinary contracts with the Bancroft District Ministry of Natural Resources and as a Hatch Contract staff specializing in a variety of fish and wildlife technical studies. Norm has extensive knowledge of aquatic systems with lead roles in the Ontario broadscale monitoring programs, spawning assessments, aquatic inventory and wetland evaluations. He is also well versed in wildlife and terrestrial studies acting as forestry compliance technician, wildlife technician, marsh monitoring program participant and an assistant instructor to the Ontario Fur Harvester Management Course.
- Site Investigation 2
  - ◆ Date, Times and Duration of Site Investigation
    - Date: June 21, 2011
    - Start Time: 0530
    - End Time: 0800
    - Duration: 2.5 hours
  - ◆ Weather Conditions During Site Investigation
    - Temperature: 13°C
    - Beaufort Wind: 0 to 2
    - Cloud Cover: 90%
  - ◆ Name and Qualifications of Person Conducting Site Investigation
    - Names and qualifications of NRSI staff conducting the site investigations are provided in Appendix A.

A pair of Common Loons was recorded during the site investigations, however no suitable nesting habitat is found on or within 120 m of the Project location. Nesting habitat may be found within Lauzon Lake, which is located south of the Project location.

Therefore, as there was no waterfowl nesting confirmed on or within 120 m of the Project location, consideration of further criteria is not required, and this feature is determined to not be a significant waterfowl nesting area.

### 3.1.1.2 Specialized Wildlife Habitat

Criteria for evaluation of specialized habitat for wildlife are identified within Table Q-2 of Appendix Q of the SWTHG. The criteria that were considered during the evaluation of these features are discussed in respect of the individual features below.





### 3.1.1.2.1 Wetlands supporting amphibian breeding habitat

Wetlands supporting amphibian breeding habitat were identified within the wetland communities on around the creek on and within 120 m east of the Project location. In order to evaluate the significance of wetlands supporting amphibian breeding habitat, amphibian calling surveys were completed at a point within the wetland community on two separate occasions. Surveys were completed in accordance with the protocols outlined in the Marsh Monitoring Program, which consists of 180 deg, 3-minute point counts, completed either after sunset or after 2200 hours. Survey locations are shown in Figure 3.1. Details of the surveys are provided below:

- Site Investigation 1
  - ◆ Date, Times and Duration of Site Investigation
    - Date: May 18, 2011
    - Start Time: 2115
    - End Time: 2235
    - Duration: 1 hour 20 minutes
  - ◆ Weather Conditions During Site Investigation
    - Temperature: 7 to 10°C
    - Cloud Cover: Clear sky
  - ◆ Name and Qualifications of Person Conducting Site Investigation
    - This site investigation was completed by Levi Snook and Shelley Potter:
      - Levi Snook is an Environmental Scientist with experience conducting environmental assessments on proposed hydroelectric, wind, and solar energy sites. He has diplomas in environmental science from Sir Sandford Fleming College and a degree in biology from Trent University. He has expertise in terrestrial assessments in support of Natural Heritage studies that include conducting Ecological Land Classifications, as well as wildlife inventories, including amphibian and reptile surveys.
      - Shelley Potter is an environmental professional with a marine and freshwater biology honors graduate from the University of Guelph. Previous work and internships have provided experience in the fields of environmental science, sustainable development, water conservation and analysis, fresh water biology, marine mammal biology, Ichthyology and Oceanography. Shelley recently completed an internship with the University of Queensland working with Dr. Mike Noad at the Humpback Whale Acoustic Research Collaboration. Marine Mammal Observing experience, acoustic recording experience and ability to geographically track migration patterns of humpback whales using a theodolite and Cyclops computer program was acquired. Shelley has also recently participated in terrestrial and aquatic field surveys for various renewable energy projects in Ontario.





**LEGEND**

- Building
- Amphibian Point Count Location
- ⊠ Common Nighthawk Survey Location
- - - Intermittent Watercourse
- Watercourse
- ⋯ Project Location
- ▭ 120m from Project Location
- ⊠ Area Sensitive Shrubland Area Search Location
- ▨ Area Sensitive Woodland Area Search Location
- ▭ Olive-sided Flycatcher Habitat Area Search Location
- Waterfowl Nesting Habitat Area Search Location
- Adjoining Solar Facility

Notes:  
 1. Produced by Hatch under licence from Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. Copyright (c) Queens Printer 2011.  
 2. Spatial referencing UTM NAD 83.  
 3. Satellite imagery obtained from Google Earth Pro, captured 2003.  
 4. Wetland information provided by NSRI (2011).




Figure 3.1  
 Northland Power Inc.  
**Martin's Meadows Solar Project**  
**Natural Heritage**  
**Evaluation of Significance**  
**Survey Locations**



**Blank back**



- Site Investigation 2
  - ◆ Date, Times and Duration of Site Investigation
    - Date: June 21, 2011
    - Start Time: 2000
    - End Time: 2200
    - Duration: 2 hours
  - ◆ Weather Conditions During Site Investigation
    - Temperature: 15 °C
    - Beaufort Wind: 1
    - Cloud Cover: 5%
  - ◆ Name and Qualifications of Person Conducting Site Investigation
    - Names and qualifications of NRSI staff conducting the site investigations are provided in Appendix B.

During the first site investigation, American Toad, Wood Frogs and Spring Peeper were heard within the wetland, while only spring peepers were recorded during the second site investigation.

The results of these site investigations were then used to assess the criteria for significant wetlands supporting amphibian breeding habitat:

- Provision of significant wildlife habitat – The wetland community is also considered to be a candidate significant animal movement corridor and waterfowl nesting habitat, and therefore this criteria is met.
- Degree of permanence – It is expected that water is permanently found within the creek, therefore this criteria is met.
- Species diversity of pond – Three species of frog (Spring Peeper, American Toad, Wood Frog) were recorded during amphibian surveys. Therefore, species diversity of the ponds is considered to be moderate.
- Presence of rare species – No rare species were identified during the baseline surveys.
- Size and number of ponds – The wetland community is relatively large and therefore this criteria is met.
- Diversity of submergent and emergent vegetation – A diversity of submergent and emergent vegetation was not recorded from the wetland community.
- Presence of shrubs, logs at edge of pond – Both tall and low shrubs were recorded within the wetland community, therefore this criteria is met.
- Adjacent forest habitat – Portions of the wetland community occur adjacent to forest communities, therefore this criteria is met.

- Water quality – Water quality is unknown.
- Level of disturbance – Active agricultural operations occur on either side of the wetland community.

Therefore, as the criteria for provision of significant wildlife habitat, degree of permanence, species diversity, size, presence of shrubs and adjacent forest habitat have been met, this feature is determined to be a significant wetland supporting amphibian breeding habitat.

#### 3.1.1.2.2 Habitat for Area-Sensitive Shrubland Species

Area-sensitive shrubland birds were assessed through a random area search of suitable habitats during the breeding season. The search area is shown in Figure 3.1. Details of this survey are provided below (note: duration includes area searches of all habitat types).

- Date, Times and Duration of Site Investigation
  - ◆ Date: June 21, 2011
  - ◆ Start Time: 0530
  - ◆ End Time: 0800
  - ◆ Duration: 2.5 hours
- Weather Conditions During Site Investigation
  - ◆ Temperature: 13°C
  - ◆ Beaufort Wind: 0 to 2
  - ◆ Cloud Cover: 90%
- Name and Qualifications of Person Conducting Site Investigation
  - ◆ Names and qualifications of NRSI staff conducting the site investigations are provided in Appendix A.

Of the birds detected, none are considered to be area-sensitive shrubland species. Therefore, this habitat is not considered to be significant habitat for area-sensitive species, and further comparison to the criteria is not required.

#### 3.1.1.2.3 Habitat for Area-Sensitive Woodland Species

Area-sensitive woodland birds were assessed through a random area search of suitable habitats during the breeding season. The search area is shown in Figure 3.1. Details of this survey are provided in Section 3.1.1.2.2

Of the birds species recorded, only singing male American Redstart were recorded within the woodland communities on and within 120 m of the access road across Munroe Creek.

These results were then compared against the criteria for area-sensitive species:

- Presence of rare, uncommon or declining species – American Redstart are not a rare, uncommon or declining species, and therefore this criteria is not met.

- Overall area of site – The forest community is part of a larger network of forest communities, and therefore this criteria is met.
- Area of forest interior contained within the forest stand – There is more than 10 ha of interior forest found present within the stand, and therefore this criteria is met.
- Age and tree composition of forest stand – An array of tree composition was noted within the stand, with most trees mid-aged. Therefore, this criteria is met.
- Amount of vertical stratification of site – Vertical stratification was not noted within the forest community, and therefore this criteria is not met.
- Amount of contiguous closed-canopy/open areas in forest stand – The forest community has a relatively closed canopy, and therefore this criteria is met.
- Degree of disturbance on site – Given the adjacent agricultural activity, this criteria is not met.
- Amount of adjacent residential development – There are occasional residences, but no true residential development, therefore this criteria is met.
- Current representation of habitat in planning area – This habitat is abundantly available within the planning area, therefore this criteria is not met.
- Provision of significant wildlife habitat – There are no other candidate significant wildlife habitats identified in association with these communities, therefore this criteria is not met.

With respect to the woodlands on and within 120 m of the Munroe Creek crossing, though several of the criteria have been met, as American Redstart are an abundant species both within the region and the province, and since breeding habitat for American Redstart is also abundantly available across the province, areas of habitat on and within 120 m of the Project location are not considered to be significant wildlife habitat

### 3.1.1.3 *Habitat for species of conservation concern*

#### 3.1.1.3.1 Olive-sided Flycatcher

Area searches of shrubland and woodland habitats, as previously described in Sections 3.1.1.2.2 and 3.1.1.2.3, respectively, did not result in any observations of Olive-sided Flycatcher. As a result, it is determined that they are not present on or within 120 m of the Project location.

#### 3.1.1.3.2 Common Nighthawk

Evening bird surveys were completed in conjunction with the second site investigation for wetlands supporting amphibian breeding habitat (see Section 3.1.1.2.1 for details of timing and weather conditions). Survey locations are shown in Figure 3.1. No Common Nighthawk were recorded during the surveys on or within 120 m of the Project location.

#### 3.1.1.3.3 *Carex haydenii*

This species was not detected during vegetation surveys of suitable habitats on and within 120 m of the Project location. Details of vegetation surveys have been previously identified in the Natural Heritage Site Investigations Report (Hatch, 2012b).

#### 3.1.1.3.4 *Carex wiegandii*

This species was not detected during vegetation surveys of suitable habitats on and within 120 m of the Project location. Details of vegetation surveys have been previously identified in the Natural Heritage Site Investigations Report (Hatch, 2012b).

#### 3.1.1.3.5 *Scirpus heterochaetus*

This species was not detected during vegetation surveys of suitable habitats on and within 120 m of the Project location. Details of vegetation surveys have been previously identified in the Natural Heritage Site Investigations Report (Hatch, 2012b).

#### 3.1.1.3.6 *Vaccinium ovalifolium*

This species was not detected during vegetation surveys of suitable habitats on and within 120 m of the Project location. Details of vegetation surveys have been previously identified in the Natural Heritage Site Investigations Report (Hatch, 2012b).

#### 3.1.1.4 *Animal Movement Corridors*

A candidate significant animal movement was identified in association with the creek and the associated riparian habitat on and within 120 m of the Project location. Evaluation of animal movement corridors is identified within Section 8.7 of the SWHTG. The criteria for significance are outlined in Table Q-4 of Appendix Q in the SWHTG, and are provided below along with the evaluation for these features:

- Importance of areas to be linked by corridor – The corridor links Lauzon Lake with waterbodies further north, likely providing linkage between breeding and foraging areas for a variety of wildlife species, therefore this criteria is met.
- Dimensions of corridor – The corridor near the Project location varies in width from 250 to 300 m wide, and therefore this criteria is met.
- Continuity of corridor – The corridor is broken by a road, and therefore this criteria is not met.
- Habitat and habitat structure of corridor – The corridor consists of a range of habitats from marshland, to thicket swamp, to coniferous swamp, to upland forest, this criteria is met.
- Species found in corridor or presumed to be using corridor – It is assumed that a diverse array of species would use the corridor and therefore this criteria is met.
- Risk of mortality for species using corridor – There is a moderate risk of mortality for species using the corridor given the presence of a road crossing, though not well travelled, and open agricultural lands adjacent to the corridor providing for ease of predator movement. Therefore, this criteria is not met.
- Opportunity for protection – As this feature is associated with a watercourse, opportunity for protection is good and therefore this criteria is met.
- Provision of other related values (such as erosion protection) – As this corridor includes riparian habitats, it provides protection for soil erosion and water quality, as well as for foraging opportunities for other wildlife species. Therefore, this criteria is met.



Therefore, as several criteria have been met, the corridor is determined to be a significant animal movement corridor.

### 3.1.2 **Distribution Line Project Location**

In accordance with Appendix D of the NHAG, all wildlife habitat identified within 120 m of the distribution line Project location during the site investigations are considered to be "Generalized Candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat". As such the features listed below will be carried forward to the Environmental Impact Study

- Seasonal Concentration Areas
  - ◆ Winter deer yards/moose late winter habitat
  - ◆ Waterfowl stopover and staging areas
  - ◆ Waterfowl nesting sites
- Specialized Wildlife Habitats
  - ◆ Area-sensitive woodland/shrubland/grassland habitats
  - ◆ Moose aquatic feeding areas
  - ◆ Old growth or mature forest stands
  - ◆ Woodlands supporting amphibian breeding habitat
  - ◆ Wetlands supporting amphibian breeding habitat
  - ◆ Mink, otter, marten and fisher denning sites
  - ◆ Specialized raptor nesting habitat
  - ◆ Seeps and springs
- Habitat for Species of Conservation Concern
  - ◆ Northern Long-eared Bat
  - ◆ Red-necked Grebe
  - ◆ Short-eared Owl
  - ◆ Common Nighthawk
  - ◆ Canada Warbler
  - ◆ Bald Eagle
  - ◆ Olive-Sided Flycatcher
  - ◆ *Vaccinium ovalifolium*
  - ◆ *Scirpus heterochaetus*
  - ◆ *Carex wiegandii*

- ◆ *Carex tetanica*
- ◆ *Carex loliacea*
- ◆ *Carex haydenii*
- Animal Movement Corridors associated with several waterbodies within 120 m of the Project location

### 3.2 Date of Beginning and Completion of Evaluation

The evaluation of wildlife habitat commenced with records review in May 2010 and is finalized with the completion of this Report in February 2012. Site investigations were completed in association with this evaluation on August 24, 2010, and May 18, June 23, and June 24, 2011.

### 3.3 Overall Conclusion

Based on the evaluation above, the following significant wildlife habitat features were identified:

- Solar panel Project location
  - ◆ Animal movement corridor associated with the creek and riparian habitat
  - ◆ Wetlands supporting amphibian breeding habitat around Munroe Creek
- Distribution line Project location
  - ◆ Generalized Characterized Candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat
    - Seasonal Concentration Areas
      - Winter deer yards/moose late winter habitat
      - Waterfowl stopover and staging areas
      - Waterfowl nesting sites
    - Specialized Wildlife Habitats
      - Area-sensitive woodland/shrubland/grassland habitats
      - Moose aquatic feeding areas
      - Old growth or mature forest stands
      - Woodlands supporting amphibian breeding habitat
      - Wetlands supporting amphibian breeding habitat
      - Mink, otter, marten and fisher denning sites
      - Specialized raptor nesting habitat
      - Seeps and springs
    - Habitat for Species of Conservation Concern
      - Northern Long-eared Bat

- o Red-necked Grebe
- o Short-eared Owl
- o Common Nighthawk
- o Canada Warbler
- o Bald Eagle
- o Olive-Sided Flycatcher
- o *Vaccinium ovalifolium*
- o *Scirpus heterochaetus*
- o *Carex wiegandii*
- o *Carex tetanica*
- o *Carex loliacea*
- o *Carex haydenii*
- Animal Movement Corridors associated with several waterbodies within 120 m of the Project location

### 3.4 Name and Qualifications of Evaluator

Evaluations of wildlife habitat were completed by Sean K. Male of Hatch.

Sean K. Male, M.Sc. is a Terrestrial Ecologist specializing in assessments of terrestrial habitat, flora and fauna. Sean received his Bachelors of Science (Honours) in Biology from Queen's University, where he completed his Honour's thesis under Dr. Raleigh J. Robertson, studying the impacts of nestbox density in Tree Swallows (*Tachycineta bicolor*) on nest-building behaviour. He then completed a Master's of Science degree in the Watershed Ecosystem Graduate Program at Trent University under Dr. Erica Nol. Sean's thesis focussed on examining the impacts of a Canadian diamond mine on a population of breeding passerines. For his thesis, Sean spent two summers in the Canadian arctic studying populations of Lapland Longspurs (*Calcarius lapponicus*) around the Ekati Diamond Mine, located 300 km northeast of Yellowknife. While at Trent, Sean participated in the Northern Saw-whet Owl (*Aegolius acadicus*) Migration Banding Project at the Oliver Centre. Following his time at Trent, Sean participated in the Landscape Monitoring Program, participating in a study of the impacts of woodlot size on breeding birds.

Sean joined Hatch as a Terrestrial Ecologist in 2006. Since joining Hatch, Sean has participated in several environmental assessments, REAs and other regulatory approvals for hydro, wind and solar power developments as the terrestrial biologist specializing in field investigations identifying flora and fauna species, including species of significance. He has developed and implemented baseline monitoring and impact assessment programs for both terrestrial wildlife and plant communities, including detailed bird and bat studies for several wind power developments, including the proposed 100-MW Coldwell wind power development near Marathon, Ontario, a proposed 20-MW facility near Port Dover, Ontario, and a proposed 110-MW wind facility in southwestern Ontario. Sean has

also conducted terrestrial and wetland vegetation surveys for several proposed hydropower projects totalling over 40 MW in southern and northern Ontario and has participated in fisheries surveys for several of these projects.

## **4. Wetlands**

### **4.1 Solar Panel Project Location**

The evaluation of the wetland communities was completed separately and can be found in Appendix A. The conclusion of the wetland evaluation was that these communities were provincially significant.

### **4.2 Distribution Line Project Location**

There are no wetlands identified on the Distribution Line Project Location, however there are a number of wetlands identified within 120 m of this Project location. These wetlands have been identified to be associated with 10 wetland complexes.

Two of these wetland complexes has been previously assessed as a provincially significant wetland (Section 4.1 and Hatch, 2012c). In accordance with Appendix C of the Natural Heritage Assessment Guide, the eight remaining wetland complexes are assumed to be provincially significant wetlands. The characteristics of these eight wetland communities that must be documented as per the requirements of Appendix C are identified in Table 4.1.



**Table 4.1 Wetland Characteristics and Ecological Functions of Wetlands within 120 m of the Distribution Line Project Location**

Ecological Function	Wetland Catch Basin 2	Wetland Catch Basin 3	Wetland Catch Basin 4	Wetland Catch Basin 5	Wetland Catch Basin 6	Wetland Catch Basin 7	Wetland Catch Basin 8
Drainage Basin Size (ha)	2015	1432	807		1061	1496	1424
Actual Wetland Size (ha) (within 120 m of distribution line)	47.67	29.47	34.57	1.6	30.1	33.1	22.23
Wetland Type	Within 120 m – Marsh Swamp/thicket swamp communities also present within catch basin	Within 120 m – Swamp Marsh/thicket swamp communities also present within catch basin	Within 120 m – Swamp Marsh/thicket swamp communities also present within catch basin	Within 120 m – Marsh Swamp/thicket swamp communities also present within catch basin	Within 120 m – Swamp Marsh/thicket swamp communities also present within catch basin	Within 120 m – Swamp Marsh/thicket swamp communities also present within catch basin	Within 120 m – Marsh Swamp/thicket swamp communities also present within catch basin
Site Type	Palustrine/Riverine	Palustrine/Riverine	Palustrine/Riverine	Palustrine/Riverine	Palustrine/Riverine	Palustrine/Riverine	Palustrine/Riverine/Lacustrine
Vegetation Communities (within 120 m of distribution line)	gcM; cS; tsS	cS; gcM	cS; tsS	gcM	cS; tsS; gcM	cS; tsS; gcM	gcM; tsS; cS
Proximity to other wetlands	Hydrologically connected by surface water to other wetlands (different dominant wetland type) or open lake or river within 1.5 km	Hydrologically connected by surface water to other wetlands (different dominant wetland type) or open lake or river within 1.5 km	Hydrologically connected by surface water to other wetlands (different dominant wetland type) or open lake or river within 1.5 km	Hydrologically connected by surface water to other wetlands (different dominant wetland type) or open lake or river within 1.5 km	Hydrologically connected by surface water to other wetlands (different dominant wetland type) or open lake or river within 1.5 km	Hydrologically connected by surface water to other wetlands (different dominant wetland type) or open lake or river within 1.5 km	Hydrologically connected by surface water to other wetlands (different dominant wetland type) or open lake or river within 1.5 km
Interspersion	Medium to High	Medium to High	Medium to High	Medium to High	Medium to High	Medium to High	Medium to High
Open Water Types	Type 3: Open water occupies 5-25% of the wetland area, occurring in ponds of various sizes; vegetation occurs in dense patches or diffuse open stands.	Type 1: Open water occupies < 5% of the wetland area.	Type 2: Open water occupies 5-25% of the wetland area, occurring in a central area	Type 2: Open water occupies 5-25% of the wetland area, occurring in a central area	Type 3: Open water occupies 5-25% of the wetland area, occurring in ponds of various sizes; vegetation occurs in dense patches or diffuse open stands	Type 3: Open water occupies 5-25% of the wetland area, occurring in ponds of various sizes; vegetation occurs in dense patches or diffuse open stands	Type 5: Open water occupies 26-75% of the wetland area, occurring in a pattern where small ponds and “embayments” are common
Flood Attenuation (total)	None of the wetland communities located within 120 m of the Project location are considered to be isolated communities, however isolated wetland communities may be found elsewhere within the catchment basin, more than 120 m from the Project location. Wetland vegetation communities along watercourses within 120 m of the Project would provide stormwater retention, and therefore flood attenuation benefits.	None of the wetland communities located within 120 m of the Project location are considered to be isolated communities, however isolated wetland communities may be found elsewhere within the catchment basin, more than 120 m from the Project location. Wetland vegetation communities along watercourses within 120 m of the Project would provide stormwater retention, and therefore flood attenuation benefits.	None of the wetland communities located within 120 m of the Project location are considered to be isolated communities, however isolated wetland communities may be found elsewhere within the catchment basin, more than 120 m from the Project location. Wetland vegetation communities along watercourses within 120 m of the Project would provide stormwater retention, and therefore flood attenuation benefits.	None of the wetland communities located within 120 m of the Project location are considered to be isolated communities, however isolated wetland communities may be found elsewhere within the catchment basin, more than 120 m from the Project location. Wetland vegetation communities along watercourses within 120 m of the Project would provide stormwater retention, and therefore flood attenuation benefits.	None of the wetland communities located within 120 m of the Project location are considered to be isolated communities, however isolated wetland communities may be found elsewhere within the catchment basin, more than 120 m from the Project location. Wetland vegetation communities along watercourses within 120 m of the Project would provide stormwater retention, and therefore flood attenuation benefits.	None of the wetland communities located within 120 m of the Project location are considered to be isolated communities, however isolated wetland communities may be found elsewhere within the catchment basin, more than 120 m from the Project location. Wetland vegetation communities along watercourses within 120 m of the Project would provide stormwater retention, and therefore flood attenuation benefits.	None of the wetland communities located within 120 m of the Project location are considered to be isolated communities, however isolated wetland communities may be found elsewhere within the catchment basin, more than 120 m from the Project location. Wetland vegetation communities along watercourses within 120 m of the Project would provide stormwater retention, and therefore flood attenuation benefits.

Ecological Function	Wetland Catch Basin 2	Wetland Catch Basin 3	Wetland Catch Basin 4	Wetland Catch Basin 5	Wetland Catch Basin 6	Wetland Catch Basin 7	Wetland Catch Basin 8
Water Quality Improvement (total)	Given the presence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• tertiary roadways and corridors within the catchment basin</li> <li>• agricultural and forestry activities within the upland areas</li> </ul> the wetland communities are determined to provide moderate water quality improvement functions	Given the presence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a secondary roadway within the catchment basin</li> <li>• tertiary roadways and corridors within the catchment basin</li> <li>• agricultural and forestry activities within the upland areas</li> <li>• a small pit within the catchment basin</li> </ul> the wetland communities are determined to provide moderate water quality improvement functions	Given the presence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• tertiary roadways and corridors within the catchment basin</li> <li>• agricultural and forestry activities within the upland areas</li> </ul> the wetland communities are determined to provide low water quality improvement functions	Given the presence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• tertiary roadways and corridors within the catchment basin</li> <li>• agricultural and forestry activities within the upland areas</li> </ul> the wetland communities are determined to provide low water quality improvement functions	Given the presence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a major hydro corridor from the Long Sault hydroelectric station within the catchment basin</li> <li>• tertiary roadways and corridors within the catchment basin</li> <li>• agricultural and forestry activities within the upland areas</li> </ul> the wetland communities are determined to provide moderate to high water quality improvement functions	Given the presence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a major hydro corridor from the Long Sault hydroelectric station within the catchment basin</li> <li>• tertiary roadways and corridors within the catchment basin</li> <li>• forestry activities within the upland areas</li> </ul> the wetland communities are determined to provide moderate to high water quality improvement functions	Given the presence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a major hydro corridor from the Long Sault hydroelectric station within the catchment basin</li> <li>• tertiary roadways and corridors within the catchment basin</li> <li>• agricultural and forestry activities within the upland areas</li> </ul> the wetland communities are determined to provide moderate to high water quality improvement functions
Shoreline Erosion Control	Thicket shrub and meadow marsh communities associated with the palustrine/riverine wetland communities within (and beyond) 120 m of the Project location provide high shoreline erosion control functions	Thicket shrub and meadow marsh communities associated with the palustrine/riverine wetland communities within (and beyond) 120 m of the Project location provide high shoreline erosion control functions	Thicket shrub and meadow marsh communities associated with the palustrine/riverine wetland communities within (and beyond) 120 m of the Project location provide high shoreline erosion control functions	Thicket shrub and meadow marsh communities associated with the palustrine/riverine wetland communities within (and beyond) 120 m of the Project location provide high shoreline erosion control functions	Thicket shrub and meadow marsh communities associated with the palustrine/riverine wetland communities within (and beyond) 120 m of the Project location provide high shoreline erosion control functions	Thicket shrub and meadow marsh communities associated with the palustrine/riverine wetland communities within (and beyond) 120 m of the Project location provide high shoreline erosion control functions	Thicket shrub and meadow marsh communities associated with the palustrine/riverine and lacustrine wetland communities found within the catchment basin provide high shoreline erosion control functions
Groundwater Recharge (Total)	Wetlands within 120 m of the Project location are primarily palustrine/riverine, and therefore provide limited to medium potential for groundwater recharge, primarily during annual flooding events, such as spring freshet.	Wetlands within 120 m of the Project location are primarily palustrine/riverine, and therefore provide limited to medium potential for groundwater recharge, primarily during annual flooding events, such as spring freshet.	Wetlands within 120 m of the Project location are primarily palustrine/riverine, and therefore provide limited to medium potential for groundwater recharge, primarily during annual flooding events, such as spring freshet.	Wetlands within 120 m of the Project location are primarily palustrine/riverine, and therefore provide limited to medium potential for groundwater recharge, primarily during annual flooding events, such as spring freshet.	Wetlands within 120 m of the Project location are primarily palustrine/riverine, and therefore provide limited to medium potential for groundwater recharge, primarily during annual flooding events, such as spring freshet.	Wetlands within 120 m of the Project location are primarily palustrine/riverine, and therefore provide limited to medium potential for groundwater recharge, primarily during annual flooding events, such as spring freshet.	Wetlands within 120 m of the Project location are primarily palustrine/riverine, and therefore provide limited to medium potential for groundwater recharge, primarily during annual flooding events, such as spring freshet. The lacustrine wetland communities around the south shore of Lower Deception Lake would provide no groundwater recharge potential.
Species Rarity (Total)	No rare species noted during 2011 surveys within the wetland. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeding Habitat for Endangered or Threatened Species = none</li> </ul>	No rare species noted during 2011 surveys within the wetland. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeding Habitat for Endangered or Threatened Species = none</li> </ul>	No rare species noted during 2011 surveys within the wetland. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeding Habitat for Endangered or Threatened Species = none</li> </ul>	No rare species noted during 2011 surveys within the wetland. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeding Habitat for Endangered or Threatened Species = none</li> </ul>	No rare species noted during 2011 surveys within the wetland. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeding Habitat for Endangered or Threatened Species = none</li> </ul>	No rare species noted during 2011 surveys within the wetland. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeding Habitat for Endangered or Threatened Species = none</li> </ul>	No rare species noted during 2011 surveys within the wetland. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breeding Habitat for Endangered or Threatened Species = none</li> </ul>

Ecological Function	Wetland Catch Basin 2	Wetland Catch Basin 3	Wetland Catch Basin 4	Wetland Catch Basin 5	Wetland Catch Basin 6	Wetland Catch Basin 7	Wetland Catch Basin 8
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traditional Migration or Feeding Areas for an Endangered or Threatened Species = none</li> <li>Provincially Significant Plant and Animal Species = none</li> <li>Regionally Significant Species = none</li> <li>Locally Significant Species = none</li> <li>Species of Special Status = none</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traditional Migration or Feeding Areas for an Endangered or Threatened Species = none</li> <li>Provincially Significant Plant and Animal Species = none</li> <li>Regionally Significant Species = none</li> <li>Locally Significant Species = none</li> <li>Species of Special Status = none</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traditional Migration or Feeding Areas for an Endangered or Threatened Species = none</li> <li>Provincially Significant Plant and Animal Species = none</li> <li>Regionally Significant Species = none</li> <li>Locally Significant Species = none</li> <li>Species of Special Status = none</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traditional Migration or Feeding Areas for an Endangered or Threatened Species = none</li> <li>Provincially Significant Plant and Animal Species = none</li> <li>Regionally Significant Species = none</li> <li>Locally Significant Species = none</li> <li>Species of Special Status = none</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traditional Migration or Feeding Areas for an Endangered or Threatened Species = none</li> <li>Provincially Significant Plant and Animal Species = none</li> <li>Regionally Significant Species = none</li> <li>Locally Significant Species = none</li> <li>Species of Special Status = none</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traditional Migration or Feeding Areas for an Endangered or Threatened Species = none</li> <li>Provincially Significant Plant and Animal Species = none</li> <li>Regionally Significant Species = none</li> <li>Locally Significant Species = none</li> <li>Species of Special Status = none</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traditional Migration or Feeding Areas for an Endangered or Threatened Species = none</li> <li>Provincially Significant Plant and Animal Species = none</li> <li>Regionally Significant Species = none</li> <li>Locally Significant Species = none</li> <li>Species of Special Status = none</li> </ul>
Significant Features and Habitats (Total)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Colonial Waterbirds = none</li> <li>Winter Cover for Wildlife = none</li> <li>Waterfowl Staging and/or Molting Area = none</li> <li>Waterfowl Breeding = none</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Colonial Waterbirds = none</li> <li>Winter Cover for Wildlife = none</li> <li>Waterfowl Staging and/or Molting Area = none</li> <li>Waterfowl Breeding = none</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Colonial Waterbirds = none</li> <li>Winter Cover for Wildlife = none</li> <li>Waterfowl Staging and/or Molting Area = none</li> <li>Waterfowl Breeding = none</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Colonial Waterbirds = none</li> <li>Winter Cover for Wildlife = none</li> <li>Waterfowl Staging and/or Molting Area = none</li> <li>Waterfowl Breeding = none</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Colonial Waterbirds = none</li> <li>Winter Cover for Wildlife = none</li> <li>Waterfowl Staging and/or Molting Area = none</li> <li>Waterfowl Breeding = none</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Colonial Waterbirds = none</li> <li>Winter Cover for Wildlife = none</li> <li>Waterfowl Staging and/or Molting Area = none</li> <li>Waterfowl Breeding = none</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Colonial Waterbirds = none</li> <li>Winter Cover for Wildlife = none</li> <li>Waterfowl Staging and/or Molting Area = none</li> <li>Waterfowl Breeding = none</li> </ul>
Fish Habitat (Total)	<p>No specific fish community or habitat assessment work has been conducted.</p> <p>The watercourses and associated riparian wetlands within the community are deemed to provide spawning, nursery and residence habitat for the fish community, as well as some migration/movement function as fish travel to and from various habitat areas.</p>	<p>No specific fish community or habitat assessment work has been conducted.</p> <p>The watercourses and associated riparian wetlands within the community are deemed to provide spawning, nursery and residence habitat for the fish community, as well as some migration/movement function as fish travel to and from various habitat areas.</p>	<p>No specific fish community or habitat assessment work has been conducted.</p> <p>The watercourses and associated riparian wetlands within the community are deemed to provide spawning, nursery and residence habitat for the fish community, as well as some migration/movement function as fish travel to and from various habitat areas.</p>	<p>No specific fish community or habitat assessment work has been conducted.</p> <p>The watercourses and associated riparian wetlands within the community are deemed to provide spawning, nursery and residence habitat for the fish community, as well as some migration/movement function as fish travel to and from various habitat areas.</p>	<p>No specific fish community or habitat assessment work has been conducted.</p> <p>The watercourses and associated riparian wetlands within the community are deemed to provide spawning, nursery and residence habitat for the fish community, as well as some migration/movement function as fish travel to and from various habitat areas.</p>	<p>No specific fish community or habitat assessment work has been conducted.</p> <p>The watercourses and associated riparian wetlands within the community are deemed to provide spawning, nursery and residence habitat for the fish community, as well as some migration/movement function as fish travel to and from various habitat areas.</p>	<p>No specific fish community or habitat assessment work has been conducted.</p> <p>The watercourses and associated riparian wetlands within the community are deemed to provide spawning, nursery and residence habitat for the fish community, as well as some migration/movement function as fish travel to and from various habitat areas.</p>

Blank back

## 5. Conclusions

Results of the EOS are summarized in Table 5.1. Based on the EOS outlined above, there are significant natural features present on and within 120 m of the Project location. The locations of these features are shown in Figures 1.1 to 1.3.

An environmental impact study conducted according to the requirements of Section 38(2) of O. Reg. 359/09 will be required in order to construct the Project within 120 m of these significant natural features.

**Table 5.1 Significant Natural Features on and within 120 m of the Project Location**

Natural Feature		Project Location	Adjacent Lands (within 120 m)
<i>Solar Panel Project Location</i>			
SIGNIFICANT	Wildlife Habitat	Yes	Yes
	Wetland	Yes	Yes
PROVINCIAALLY SIGNIFICANT	Earth Science ANSI	No	No
	Life Science ANSI	No	No
<i>Distribution Line Project Location</i>			
SIGNIFICANT	Wildlife Habitat	No	Yes (generalized candidate significant wildlife habitat)
	Wetland	No	Yes (2 evaluated, 8 assumed provincially significant)
PROVINCIAALLY SIGNIFICANT	Earth Science ANSI	No	No
	Life Science ANSI	No	No



## 6. References

Hatch Ltd. 2012a. Martin's Meadows Solar Project – Natural Heritage Records Review Report. Prepared for Northland Power Inc. on behalf of Northland Power Solar Martin's Meadows L.P.

Hatch Ltd. 2012b. Martin's Meadows Solar Project – Natural Heritage Site Investigations Report. Prepared for Northland Power Inc. on behalf of Northland Power Solar Martin's Meadows L.P.

Hatch Ltd. 2012c. Long Lake Solar Project – Natural Heritage Site Investigations Report. Prepared for Northland Power Inc. on behalf of Northland Power Solar Long Lake L.P.

Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR). 2011. Natural Heritage Assessment Guide for Renewable Energy Projects. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario. 248 pp.

MNR. 2000. Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide. 151p.

**Appendix A**  
**Natural Resource Solutions Inc. (NRSI)**  
**Wetland Evaluation**

February 22, 2012

Mr. Sean Male  
Hatch Energy  
4342 Queen Street, Suite 500  
Niagara Falls, ON L2E 7J7

Dear Mr. Male,

**RE: Abitibi and Martin's Meadow Solar Project  
Summary of Wetland & Upland Vegetation Mapping,  
Breeding Bird and Amphibian Call Surveys**

### **Summary of Surveys**

On behalf of Natural Resource Solutions Inc., I am pleased to provide the following which documents the work completed at the above noted solar project being proposed by Northland Power.

The objectives of this assignment were to complete vegetation mapping, amphibian surveys, breeding bird, and evening bird surveys.

Appendix I includes a list of study team members and their roles.

### **Vegetation**

On site vegetation mapping occurred on June 22, 2011 (0900 – 1600hrs, weather 15°C, sunny, 0% cloud cover, wind – Beaufort scale 1). The standard Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (OWES) (OMNR 1993) was used by a Certified Wetland Evaluator to map and describe on-site wetlands, as well as wetlands within 120m of the project site.

In addition, a catchment basin boundary was identified that included the on-site wetlands. All wetlands in the catchment basin were also mapped and described using OWES June 21 to June 24, 2011. In this case, land access and the extent of the lands required that the mapping be completed using aerial photography supplemented with field checks of wetland polygons at strategic locations (primarily roadside).

The standard Ecological Land Classification (ELC) (Lee et al. 1998; Lee 2008) was also used by a Certified ELC staff to describe polygons outside of OWES and Forest Ecosystem Classification (FEC) (Taylor et al. 2000).

Please see Appendix II for a list of polygon labels.

The wetlands within the catchment basin were evaluated using the standard OWES system for northern Ontario. A copy of the completed evaluation, including mapping, is included in Appendix III.

### Amphibian Call Monitoring

On site amphibian call surveys were completed on June 21, 2011 (2000-2200hrs, weather 15°C, 5% cloud cover, wind – Beaufort scale 3 to 4, water temperature 19°C). The standard Marsh Monitoring Protocol (Bird Studies Canada 2009) was used in which 3 minute point counts at predetermined stations.

At the Abitibi site nothing was heard at Station 1, which was determined to be marginal amphibian habitat since no water or frog habitat was present. Three spring peepers (*Pseudacris crucifer crucifer*) were heard northeast of Station 1B (approximately 100m distance). Two spring peepers were heard north of Station 2 (approximately 100m distance). At the Martin's Meadow site, nothing was heard at Station 2. No standing water or frog habitat is present. A second station was chosen, Station 3, to replace monitoring at Station 2 which was at a sedge marsh with pockets of standing water. No amphibians were heard.

The field data forms are included in Appendix IV.

### Breeding Bird Surveys

On site breeding bird surveys were completed June 21, 2011 (0530 – 0800hrs, weather 13°C, 90% cloud cover, wind – Beaufort scale 0 to 2 ) using the standard Ontario Breeding Bird methodology (Cadman et al. 2007).

The following species were observed during that period:

Species Observed	Observed	Possible	Probable	Confirmed
Alder Flycatcher ( <i>Empidonax alnorum</i> )		S		
American Crow ( <i>Corvus brachyrhynchos</i> )	X			
American Goldfinch ( <i>Carduelis tristis</i> )		H		
American Redstart ( <i>Setophaga ruticilla</i> )		S		
American Robin ( <i>Turdus migratorius</i> )		S		
Black-and-white Warbler ( <i>Mniotilta varia</i> )		S		
Black-throated Green Warbler ( <i>Dendroica virens</i> )		S		
Blue Jay ( <i>Cyanocitta cristata</i> )		S		
Common Loon ( <i>Gavia immer</i> )	X			
Hermit Thrush ( <i>Catharus guttatus</i> )		S		
Ovenbird ( <i>Seiurus aurocapillus</i> )		S		
Red-eyed Vireo ( <i>Vireo olivaceus</i> )		S		
Sandhill Crane ( <i>Grus canadensis</i> )				FY
Song Sparrow ( <i>Melospiza melodia</i> )		S		
Tennessee Warbler ( <i>Vermivora peregrine</i> )		S		
White-throated Sparrow ( <i>Zonotrichia albicollis</i> )		S		
Yellow Warbler ( <i>Dendroica petechia</i> )		S		
Yellow-rumped Warbler ( <i>Dendroica cronoata</i> )	X			

The following species were observed within the Martin's Meadow area:

Species Observed	Observed	Possible	Probable	Confirmed
American Crow ( <i>Corvus brachyrhynchos</i> )	X			
American Goldfinch ( <i>Carduelis tristis</i> )		S		
American Redstart ( <i>Setophaga ruticilla</i> )		S		
American Robin ( <i>Turdus migratorius</i> )		S		
Black-throated Green Warbler ( <i>Dendroica virens</i> )	X			
Northern Cardinal ( <i>Cardinalis cardinalis</i> )		S		
Ovenbird ( <i>Seiurus aurocapillus</i> )		S		
Red-eyed Vireo ( <i>Vireo olivaceus</i> )		S		
Sandhill Crane ( <i>Grus canadensis</i> )		S		
Savannah Sparrow ( <i>Passerculus sandwichensis</i> )		S		
Veery ( <i>Catharus fuscescens</i> )		S		
White-throated Sparrow ( <i>Zonotrichia albicollis</i> )		S		

Observed

X Species observed in its breeding season with no evidence of breeding

Possible

H Species observed in its breeding season in suitable nesting habitat

S Singing male present or breeding calls heard in breeding season in suitable nesting habitat

Probable

P Pair observed in their breeding season in suitable nesting habitat

T Permanent territory presumed through registration of territorial song on at least 2 days, one week or more apart at the same place

D Courtship or display between a male and female or 2 males including courtship feeding and copulation

V Visiting probable nest site

A Agitated behaviour or anxiety calls of an adult

B Brood patch on adult female or cloacal protuberance on adult male

N Nest building or excavation of nest site

Confirmed

DD Distraction display or injury feigning

NU Used nest or egg shell found (occupied/laid this season)

FY Recently fledged young or downy young

AE Adults leaving or entering nest site in circumstances indicating occupied nest

FS Adult carrying faecal sac

CF Adult carrying food for young

NE Nest containing eggs

NY Nest with young seen or heard

Other species observed on site included:

Red Fox (*Vulpes vulpes*)

**Evening Bird Surveys**

Surveys for birds that are primarily active in the evening were conducted on June 21, 2011 (2000 – 2200hrs, weather 15°C, 5% cloud cover, wind – Beaufort scale 3 to 4).

The survey followed standard monitoring protocols developed for species such as whip-poor-will and common nighthawk (the two focus species for this survey) (OMNR 2011).

No nighthawks (*Chordeiles* sp.) or whip-poor-wills (*Caprimulgus vociferous*) were observed during evening surveys.



Other species observed during evening surveys included:

American Robin (*Turdus migratorius*)

Hermit Thrush (*Catharus guttatus*)

Sandhill Crane (*Grus canadensis*)

Veery (*Catharus fuscescens*)

White-throated Sparrow (*Zonotrichia albicollis*)

Red Fox (*Vulpes vulpes*)

## References

- Bird Studies Canada. 2009. Marsh Monitoring Program Participant's Handbook for Surveying Amphibians. 2009 Edition. Published by Bird Studies Canada in Cooperation with Environment Canada and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. February 2009.
- Cadman, M.D., D.A. Sutherland, G.G. Beck, D. Lepage and A.R. Couturier. 2007. Atlas of the Breeding Birds of Ontario. Available online at: <http://www.birdsontario.org/atlas/index.jsp>
- Lee, H.T., W.D. Bakowsky, J. Riley, J. Bowles, M. Puddister, P. Uhlig and S. McMurray. 1998. Ecological Land Classification for Southern Ontario: First Approximation and its Application. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Southcentral Science Section, Science Development and Transfer Branch. SCSS Field Guide FG-02.
- Lee, H. 2008. Southern Ontario Ecological Land Classification - Vegetation Type List. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources: London, Ontario.
- Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. 1993. Ontario Wetland Evaluation System. Northern Manual. Revised 1994 & 2002)
- Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. 2011. Northeast Nightjar Survey Techniques (Draft). Sudbury District MNR
- Taylor, K.C. et al. 2000. A Field Guide to Forest Ecosystems of Northeastern Ontario. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. NEST Field Guide FG-001.



## Appendix I

<b>Team Member</b>	<b>Qualification</b>	<b>Role</b>
David Stephenson	Certified Wetland Evaluator Certified ELC Certified OWES Certified Arborist	Project Management, Reporting
Jessica Grealey	Terrestrial and Wetland Biologist Certified ELC	Site Assessment
Tara Brenton	Terrestrial and Wetland Biologist Certified ELC Certified OWES Certified Arborist	Site Assessment
Charlotte Moore	Terrestrial Biologist	Site Assessment
Megan Pope	Terrestrial Biologist	Site Assessment, Data Analysis, Reporting
Gerry Schaus	GIS Technician	Mapping





## Appendix II

### Within Project Site and 120m boundary

#### OWES CLASSIFICATIONS

cS<sub>1</sub>:

[OWES: Coniferous Swamp]

h: white birch (*Betula papyrifera*), yellow birch (*Betula alleghaniensis*),  
trembling aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), balsam poplar (*Populus  
balsamifera ssp. balsamifera*)

\*c: balsam fir (*Abies balsamea*), black spruce (*Picea mariana*)

dc: balsam fir (*Abies balsamea*)

ts: speckled alder (*Alnus incana ssp. rugosa*), showy mountain-ash  
(*Sorbus decora*)

gc: blue-bead lily (*Clintonia borealis*), star-flower (*Trientalis borealis ssp.  
borealis*), bunchberry (*Cornus canadensis*), wood horsetail (*Equisetum  
sylvaticum*), ostrich fern (*Matteuccia struthiopteris var. pennsylvanica*)

m: clubmoss

cS<sub>13</sub>:

[OWES: Coniferous Swamp]

\*c: tamarack (*Larix laricina*), black spruce (*Picea mariana*)

ts: speckled alder (*Alnus incana ssp. rugosa*), showy mountain-ash  
(*Sorbus decora*), red-berried elderberry (*Sambucus racemosa ssp.  
pubens*), balsam fir (*Abies balsamea*)

ls: Labrador tea (*Ledum groenlandicum*), red raspberry (*Rubus idaeus  
ssp. idaeus*), red currant (*Ribes rubrum*)

gc: bracken fern (*Pteridium aquilinum var. latiusculum*), ostrich fern  
(*Matteuccia struthiopteris var. pennsylvanica*), woodland strawberry  
(*Fragaria vesca ssp. americana*), bunchberry (*Cornus canadensis*),  
Canada mayflower (*Maianthemum canadense*)

m: moss sp.

hS<sub>8</sub>:

[OWES: Deciduous Swamp]

\*h: trembling aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), white birch (*Betula papyrifera*)

ls: red raspberry (*Rubus idaeus ssp. idaeus*), Canada soapberry  
(*Shepherdia canadensis*), low sweet blueberry (*Vaccinium angustifolium*),  
Labrador tea (*Ledum groenlandicum*)

gc: woodland strawberry (*Fragaria vesca ssp. americana*), bunchberry  
(*Cornus canadensis*), ostrich fern (*Matteuccia struthiopteris var.  
pennsylvanica*), blue-bead lily (*Clintonia borealis*)

tsS<sub>3-5,7,18</sub>:

[OWES: Tall Shrub Swamp]

\*ts: speckled alder (*Alnus incana* spp. *rugosa*), red osier dogwood (*Cornus stolonifera*)

gc: pale touch-me-not (*Impatiens palidia*), spinulose wood fern (*Dryopteris carthusiana*), fragrant bedstraw (*Galium triflorum*)

m: moss sp.

tsS<sub>11,12</sub>:

[OWES: Tall Shrub Swamp]

\*ts: speckled alder (*Alnus incana* spp. *rugosa*), Bebb's willow (*Salix bebbiana*)

ls: Labrador tea (*Ledum groenlandicum*), blueberry (*Vaccinium angustifolium*), Bebb's willow (*Salix bebbiana*), speckled alder (*Alnus incana* spp. *rugosa*)

gc: rough-leaved goldenrod (*Solidago patula*), Philadelphia fleabane (*Erigeron philadelphicus* ssp. *philadelphicus*), tall buttercup (*Ranunculus acris*)

ne: reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), Bottlebrush sedge (*Carex comosa*), fox sedge (*Carex vulpinoidea*)

tsS<sub>46</sub>:

[OWES: Tall Shrub Swamp]

\*ts: speckled alder (*Alnus incana* spp. *rugosa*), bebb's willow (*Salix bebbiana*)

ls: red osier dogwood (*Cornus stolonifera*), red raspberry (*Rubus idaeus* ssp. *idaeus*)

gc: lady fern (*Athyrium filix-femina* var. *angustum*), tall meadowrue (*Thalictrum pubescens*), New England aster (*Symphotrichum novae-angliae*), rough goldenrod (*Solidago rugosa* ssp. *rugosa*), Common hairgrass (*Deschampia flexuosa*)

ne: reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*)

neM<sub>15</sub>:

[OWES: Narrow-leaved Emergents Marsh]

\*ne: aquatic sedge (*Carex aquatilis*)

reM<sub>14</sub>:

[OWES: Robust Emergents Marsh]

ds: speckled alder (*Alnus incana* spp. *rugosa*)

\*re: common cattail (*Typha latifolia*)

ff: greater duckweed (*Spirodela polyrhiza*)

## FEC CLASSIFICATIONS

ES6m: [FEC: Trembling Aspen-Black Spruce-Balsam Fir-Medium Soil]

*Mixedwood stands on fresh to moderately moist, medium loamy to silty soils. Medium number of shrubs, herb rich.*

## ELC CLASSIFICATIONS

MEGM3-8: [ELC: Reed Canary Grass Graminoid Meadow Type]

### Outside of Project Site and 120m boundary

## OWES CLASSIFICATIONS

cS<sub>2,27,32,33,34,37</sub>:  
[OWES: Coniferous Swamp]

tsS<sub>10,16,17,19-24,38,39,43-45,48,81</sub>:  
[OWES: Tall Shrub Swamp]

neM<sub>28,40-42,83</sub>:  
[OWES: Narrow-leaved Emergents Marsh]

reM<sub>29</sub>:  
[OWES: Robust Emergents Marsh]

## FEC CLASSIFICATIONS

ES1r: [FEC: White Spruce-White Birch-Very Shallow Soil-Species Rich]  
*Mixedwood dominated by white spruce and white birch on dry to fresh, very shallow soils (0-30cm) over bedrock. Medium number of shrubs, herb poor.*

ES6m: [FEC: Trembling Aspen-Black Spruce-Balsam Fir-Medium Soil]  
*Mixedwood stands on fresh to moderately moist, medium loamy to silty soils. Medium number of shrubs, herb rich.*

## ELC CLASSIFICATIONS

THDM2-8: [ELC: Raspberry Deciduous Shrub Thicket Type]

WODM5-1: [ELC: Moist Poplar Deciduous Woodland Type]

MEMM3: [ELC: Fresh Mixed Meadow Ecosite]





**Abitibi-Martin's Meadow-Empire Wetland Complex**

Wetland Evaluation Edition

2012

February 22, 2012

**Comments**

Attached Documents include:

Map of Interspersion

Map of Long Lake Wetland Complex Catchment Basin

Vascular Plant List

Fauna list

**Additional Information**

Official Name: Abitibi-Martin's Meadow-Empire Wetland Complex

Evaluation Edition: 2012 Class: Wetland ID.:

Wetland Significance Year/Month Last Evaluated February 22, 2012

Provincially Significat Year/Month Last Updated

Special Planning Considerations:

**Scores**

Biological: 132

Social: 107

Hydrological: 205

Special Features: 159

Overall: 603

Submitted by: Natural Resources Solutions Inc.

Date: February 22, 2012

WETLAND DATA AND SCORING RECORD

- i) **WETLAND NAME:** Abitibi-Martin's Meadow-Empire Wetland Complex
- ii) **MNR ADMINISTRATIVE REGION:** Cochrane **DISTRICT:** Cochrane  
**AREA OFFICE (if different from District):** \_\_\_\_\_
- iii) **CONSERVATION AUTHORITY JURISDICTION:**  
 (If not within a designated CA, check here:  X )
- iv) **COUNTY OR REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY:** Cochrane
- v) **TOWNSHIP:** Cochrane
- vi) **LOTS & CONCESSIONS:** Glackmeyer Conc. 11 Lot 17, Conc. 10 Lots 12-19,  
 (attach separate sheet if necessary) Conc. 9 Lots 12-19, Conc. 8 Lots 12-18,  
Conc. 7 Lots 13-18, Conc. 6 Lots 16-17, Conc. 5 Lots 15-18
- vii) **MAP AND AIR PHOTO REFERENCES**
- a) Latitude: \_\_\_\_\_ Longitude: \_\_\_\_\_
- b) UTM grid reference: Zone: 17 U Block: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Grid:E 501243 N 5442382
- c) National Topographic Series:  
 map name(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
 map number(s) \_\_\_\_\_ edition \_\_\_\_\_  
 scale 1:22,000
- d) Aerial photographs: Date photo taken: Spring 2005 Scale: Google Earth Imagery  
 Flight & plate numbers: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (attach separate sheet if necessary)
- e) Ontario Base Map numbers & scale \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (attach separate sheets if necessary)



**1.0 BIOLOGICAL COMPONENT**

**1.1 PRODUCTIVITY**

**1.1.1 GROWING DEGREE-DAYS/SOILS**

**GROWING DEGREE DAYS**

(check one)

- 1) \_\_\_\_\_ <1600
- 2) \_\_\_\_\_ 1600-2000
- 3)   X   \_\_\_\_\_ 2000-2400
- 4) \_\_\_\_\_ 2400-2800
- 5) \_\_\_\_\_ 2800-3000
- 6) \_\_\_\_\_ >3000

**SOILS**

Estimated Fractional Area

- 0.300 clay/loam
- \_\_\_\_\_ silt/marl
- \_\_\_\_\_ limestone
- \_\_\_\_\_ sand
- 0.200 humic/mesic
- 0.500 fibric
- \_\_\_\_\_ granite

**SCORING:**

Growing Degree-Days	Clay-Loam	Silt-Marl	Lime-stone	Sand	Humic-Mesic	Fibric	Granite
<1600	12	11	9	7	7	6	4
1600-2000	15	13	11	9	8	7	5
2000-2400	18	15	13	11	9	8	7
2400-2800	22	18	15	13	11	9	7
2800-3000	26	21	18	15	13	10	8
>3000	30	25	20	18	15	12	9

(maximum score 30; if wetland contains more than one soil type, evaluate based on the fractional area)

Steps required for evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_ (maximum score 30 points)

1. Select GDD line in evaluation table applicable to your wetland;
2. Determine fractional area of the wetland for each soil type;
3. Multiply fractional area of each soil type by score;
4. Sum individual soil type scores (round to nearest whole number).

In wetland complexes the evaluator should aim at determining the percentage of area occupied by the categories for the complex as a whole.

Score		
<u>18</u>	clay/loam	<u>5.40</u>
_____	silt/marl	<u>0.00</u>
_____	limestone	<u>0.00</u>
_____	sand	<u>0.00</u>
<u>9</u>	humic/mesic	<u>1.80</u>
<u>8</u>	fibric	<u>4.00</u>
_____	granite	<u>0.00</u>

**Final Score Growing Degree-Days/Soils (maximum 30 points)**

**11**

**1.1.2 WETLAND TYPE** (Fractional Area = area of wetland type/total wetland area)

Fractional Area		Score	
Bog	<input type="text"/>	x 3	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
Fen	<input type="text"/>	x 6	<input type="text" value="0.00"/>
Swamp	<input type="text" value="0.87"/>	x 8	<input type="text" value="6.96"/>
Marsh	<input type="text" value="0.13"/>	x 15	<input type="text" value="1.95"/>

**Wetland type score (maximum 15 points)** 9

**1.1.3 SITE TYPE** (Fractional Area = area of site type/total wetland area)

Fractional Area		Score	
Isolated	<input type="text"/>	x 1 =	<input type="text" value="0.000"/>
Palustrine (permanent or intermittent flow)	<input type="text" value="0.830"/>	x 2 =	<input type="text" value="1.660"/>
Riverine	<input type="text" value="0.150"/>	x 4 =	<input type="text" value="0.600"/>
Riverine (at rivermouth)	<input type="text"/>	x 5 =	<input type="text" value="0.000"/>
Lacustrine (at rivermouth)	<input type="text"/>	x 5 =	<input type="text" value="0.000"/>
Lacustrine (on enclosed bay, with barrier beach)	<input type="text"/>	x 3 =	<input type="text" value="0.000"/>
Lacustrine (exposed to lake)	<input type="text" value="0.020"/>	x 2 =	<input type="text" value="0.040"/>
		Sub Total:	<input type="text" value="2.300"/>

**Site Type Score (maximum 5 points)** 2

**1.2 BIODIVERSITY**

**1.2.1 NUMBER OF WETLAND TYPES**

(Check only one)	Score
1) <input type="text"/>	one 9 points
2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	two 13
3) <input type="checkbox"/>	three 20
4) <input type="checkbox"/>	four 30

**Number of Wetland Types Score (maximum 30 points)** 13



1.2.2 VEGETATION COMMUNITIES

Attach a separate sheet listing community (map) codes, vegetation forms and dominant species. Use the form on the following page to record percent area by dominant vegetation form. This information will be used in other parts of the evaluation.

Communities should be grouped by number of forms. For example, 2 form communities might appear as follows:

2 forms

<u>Code</u>	<u>Forms</u>	<u>Dominant Species</u>
M6	re, ff	re, <i>Typha latifolia</i> ; ff, <i>Lemna minor</i> , <i>Wolffia</i>
S1	ts, gc	ts, <i>Salix discolor</i> ; gc, <i>Impatiens capensis</i> , <i>Thelypteris palustris</i>

Note that the dominant species for each form are separated by a semicolon. The dominant species (maximum of 2) within a form are separated by commas.

Scoring:

Total # of communities with 1-3 forms = 40	Total # of communities with 4 -5 forms = 23	Total # of communities with 6 or more forms = 1
1 = 1.5 points	1 = 2 points	1 = 3 points
2 = 2.5	2 = 3.5	2 = 5
3 = 3.5	3 = 5	3 = 7
4 = 4.5	4 = 6.5	4 = 9
5 = 5	5 = 7.5	5 = 10.5
6 = 5.5	6 = 8.5	6 = 12
7 = 6	7 = 9.5	7 = 13.5
8 = 6.5	8 = 10.5	8 = 15
9 = 7	9 = 11.5	9 = 16.5
10 = 7.5	10 = 12.5	10 = 18
11 = 8	11 = 13	11 = 19
+ .5 each additional community = <u>5.0</u>	+ .5 each additional community = <u>5.0</u>	+ 1 each additional community = <u>3.0</u>
e.g., a wetland with 3 one form communities and 8 six form communities would score:	4 two form communities	12 four form communities and

6+13.5+15=34.5=35 points

**Vegetation Communities Score (maximum 45 points) 13**



**1.2.3 DIVERSITY OF SURROUNDING HABITAT**

(Check all appropriate items(1))

<input type="checkbox"/>	recent burn (< 5 yr)
<input type="checkbox"/>	abandoned agricultural land
<input type="checkbox"/>	utility corridor
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	deciduous forest
<input type="checkbox"/>	recent cutover or clearcut (<5 yr)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	coniferous forest
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	mixed forest (at least 25% conifer and 75% deciduous or vice versa)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	crops
<input type="checkbox"/>	abandoned pits and quarries
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	pasture
<input type="checkbox"/>	ravine
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	fence rows
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	open lake or deep river
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	creek flood plain
<input type="checkbox"/>	rock outcrop

**Diversity of Surrounding Habitat Score (1 for each, maximum 7 points)**

**7**

**1.2.4 PROXIMITY TO OTHER WETLANDS**

(Check first appropriate category only)

Scoring

1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hydrologically connected by surface water to other wetlands (different dominant wetland type) or open lake or river within 1.5 km	8 points
2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrologically connected by surface water to other wetlands (same dominant wetland type) within 0.5 km	8
3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrologically connected by surface water to other wetlands (different dominant wetland type),or open lake or river from 1.5 to 4 km away (Second Marsh Wetland)	5
4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrologically connected by surface water to other wetlands (same dominant wetland type) from 0.5 to 1.5 km away	5
5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Within 0.75 km of other wetlands (different dominant wetland type) or open lake or river, but not hydrologically connected by surface water	5
6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Within 1 km of other wetlands, but not hydrologically connected by surface water	2
7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	No wetland within 1 km	0

**Proximity to other Wetlands Score (Choose one only, maximum 8 points)**

**8**

**1.2.5 INTERSPERSION**

Number of Intersections (Check one)		Score
1)	26 or less	3
2)	27 to 40	6
3)	41 to 60	9
4)	61 to 80	12
5)	81 to 100	15
6)	101 to 125	18
7)	126 to 150	21
8)	151 to 175	24
9)	176 to 200	27
10)	>200	30

**Interspersion Score (Choose one only maximum 30 points)**

**24**

**1.2.6 OPEN WATER TYPES**

Permanently flooded: (Check one)		Score
1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> type 1	8
2)	<input type="checkbox"/> type 2	8
3)	<input type="checkbox"/> type 3	14
4)	<input type="checkbox"/> type 4	20
5)	<input type="checkbox"/> type 5	30
6)	<input type="checkbox"/> type 6	8
7)	<input type="checkbox"/> type 7	14
8)	<input type="checkbox"/> type 8	3
9)	<input type="checkbox"/> no open water	0

**Open Water Type Score (Choose one only maximum 30 points)**

**8**



**1.3 SIZE**696.52

hectares

73

Subtotal for Biodiversity

**Size Score (Biological Component) (maximum 50 points)****37**

Evaluation Table Size Score (Biological component)

Wetland size (ha)	Total Score for Biodiversity Subcomponent									
	<37	37-47	48-60	61-72	73-84	85-96	97-108	109-120	121-132	>132
<20 ha	1	5	7	8	9	17	25	34	43	50
20-40	5	7	8	9	10	19	28	37	46	50
41-60	6	8	9	10	11	21	31	40	49	50
61-80	7	9	10	11	13	23	34	43	50	50
81-100	8	10	11	13	15	25	37	46	50	50
101-120	9	11	13	15	18	28	40	49	50	50
121-140	10	13	15	17	21	31	43	50	50	50
141-160	11	15	17	19	23	34	46	50	50	50
161-180	13	17	19	21	25	37	49	50	50	50
181-200	15	19	21	23	28	40	50	50	50	50
201-400	17	21	23	25	31	43	50	50	50	50
401-600	19	23	25	28	34	46	50	50	50	50
601-800	21	25	28	31	37	49	50	50	50	50
801-1000	23	28	31	34	40	50	50	50	50	50
1001-1200	25	31	34	37	43	50	50	50	50	50
1201-1400	28	34	37	40	46	50	50	50	50	50
1401-1600	31	37	40	43	49	50	50	50	50	50
1601-1800	34	40	43	46	50	50	50	50	50	50
1801-2000	37	43	47	49	50	50	50	50	50	50
>2000	40	46	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50

**2.0 SOCIAL COMPONENT**

**2.1 ECONOMICALLY VALUABLE PRODUCTS**

**2.1.1 WOOD PRODUCTS**

Area of wetland forested (ha), i.e. dominant form is h or c. Note that this is not wetland size. (Check one only)

		Score
1)	<input type="checkbox"/> <5 ha	0
2)	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 -25 ha	4
3)	<input type="checkbox"/> 26 -50 ha	6
4)	<input type="checkbox"/> 51- 100 ha	8
5)	<input type="checkbox"/> 101 -200 ha	11
6)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> >200 ha	14

Source of information: NRSI mapping

**Wood Products Score (Score one only, maximum 14 points) 14**

**2.1.2 Lowbush Cranberry**

(Check one)

		Score (Choose one)
Present	1) <input type="checkbox"/>	2 points
Absent	2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0	0

Source of information: \_\_\_\_\_

**Lowbush Cranberry Score (maximum 2 points) 0**

**2.1.3 Wild Rice**

(Check one)

		Score (Choose one)
Present (at least 0.5 ha)	1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X	10 points
Absent	2) <input type="checkbox"/>	0

Source of information: Cochrane MNR office

**Wild Rice Score (maximum 10 points) 10**

**2.1.4 COMMERCIAL FISH (BAIT FISH AND/OR COARSE FISH)**

(Check one)

Present

1)

X

Score (Choose one)

12 points

Absent

2)

0

Source of information:

NRSI

**Commercial Fish Score (maximum 12 points)**

12

**2.1.5 FURBEARERS**

(Consult Appendix 9)

Name of furbearer

Source of information

1)	beaver	3
2)	red fox	3
3)	red squirrel	3
4)	marten	3
5)		

field work
field work
field work
Cochrane MNR office

Scoring: 3 points for each species. maximum 12

**Furbearer Score (maximum 12 points)**

12

**2.2 RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES**

Type of Wetland-Associated Use						
Intensity of Use	Hunting		Nature Enjoyment/ Ecosystem Study		Fishing	
High	40 points		40 points		40 points	
Moderate	20		20		20	
Low	8	X	8		8	X
Not possible/NotKnown	0		0	X	0	
Totals		8		0		8

(score one level for each of the three wetland uses; scores are cumulative; maximum score 80 points)

Sources of information:

Hunting: Cochrane MNR office

Nature: Cochrane MNR office

Fishing: Cochrane MNR office

**Recreational Activities Score (maximum 80 points)**

16

**2.3 LANDSCAPE AESTHETICS**

**2.3.1 DISTINCTNESS**

(Check one)			Score (Choose one)
Clearly distinct	1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 points
Indistinct	2)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0

**Landscape Distinctness Score (maximum 3 points)**

**0**

**2.3.2 ABSENCE OF HUMAN DISTURBANCE**

(Check one)			Score (Choose one)
Human disturbances absent or nearly so	1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	7 points
One or several localized disturbances	2)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4
Moderate disturbance; localized water pollution	3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	2
Wetland intact but impairment of ecosystem quality intense in some areas	4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	1
Extreme ecological degradation, or water pollution severe and widespread	5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	0

Source of information: air photos, field work

**Absence of Human Disturbance Score (maximum 7 points)**

**4**

**2.4 EDUCATION AND PUBLIC AWARENESS**

**2.4.1 EDUCATIONAL USES**

(Check one)			Score (Choose one)
Frequent	1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	20 points
Infrequent	2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	12
No visits	3)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0

Source of information: Cochrane MNR office

**Educational Uses Score (maximum 20 points)**

**0**

**2.4.2 FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS**

(check one)			Score (Choose one)
Staffed interpretation centre	1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	8 points
No interpretation centre or staff but a system of self-guiding trails or brochures available	2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	4
Facilities such as maintained paths (e.g., woodchips) boardwalks, boat launches or observation towers but no brochures or other interpretation	3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	2
No facilities or programs	4)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0

Source of information: Cochrane MNR office

**Facilities and Programs Score (maximum 8 points)**

**0**



**2.4.3 RESEARCH AND STUDIES**

(check appropriate spaces)

Long term research has been done	<input type="checkbox"/>	Score	12 points
Research papers published in refereed scientific journal or as a thesis	<input type="checkbox"/>		10
One or more (non-research) reports have been written on some aspect of the wetland 's flora fauna hydrology etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>		5
No research or reports	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		0

Attach list of known reports by above categories

**Research and Studies Score (Score is cumulative, maximum 12 points)****0****2.5 PROXIMITY TO AREAS OF HUMAN SETTLEMENT**

Circle the highest applicable score

Distance of wetland from settlement	1) population > 10,000		2) population 2,500 -10,000		3) population <2,500 or cottage community	
	40 points	<input type="checkbox"/>	26	<input type="checkbox"/>	16	<input type="checkbox"/>
1) Within or adjoining settlement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) 0.5 to 10 km from settlement	26	<input type="checkbox"/>	16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) 10 to 60 km from settlement	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) >60 km from settlement	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	0	<input type="checkbox"/>
5) >100 km from settlement	0	<input type="checkbox"/>	0	<input type="checkbox"/>	0	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>0</b>		<b>16</b>		<b>0</b>	

Name of settlement: Town of Cochrane**Proximity to Human Settlement Score (maximum 40 points)****16****2.6 OWNERSHIP (FA= fraction Area)**

Score

FA of wetland in public or private ownership held under contract or in trust for wetland protection	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	10	=	<input type="checkbox"/>
FA of wetland area in public ownership,not as above	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	8	=	<input type="checkbox"/>
FA of wetland area in private ownership,not as above	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	4	=	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<b>1.00</b>				<b>4.00</b>

Source of information: Cochrane MNR office**Ownership Score (maximum 10 points)****4**

2.7 SIZE**696.52** hectares**80** Subtotal for Social

Evaluation Table for Size Score (Social Component)

Wetland Size (ha)	Total for Size Dependent Score									
	<31	31-45	46-60	61-75	76-90	91-105	106-109	121-135	136-150	>150
<2 ha	1	2	4	8	10	12	14	14	14	15
2 - 4ha	1	2	4	8	12	13	14	14	15	16
5 - 8ha	2	2	5	9	13	14	15	15	16	16
9 - 12ha	3	3	6	10	14	15	15	16	17	17
13-17	3	4	7	10	14	15	16	16	17	17
18-28	4	5	8	11	15	16	16	17	17	18
29-37	5	7	10	13	16	17	18	18	19	19
38-49	5	7	10	13	16	17	18	18	19	20
50-62	5	8	11	14	17	17	18	19	20	20
63-81	5	8	11	15	17	18	19	20	20	20
82-105	6	9	11	15	18	18	19	20	20	20
106-137	6	9	12	16	18	19	20	20	20	20
138-178	6	9	13	16	18	19	20	20	20	20
179-233	6	9	13	16	18	20	20	20	20	20
234-302	7	9	13	16	18	20	20	20	20	20
303-393	7	9	14	17	18	20	20	20	20	20
394-511	7	10	14	17	18	20	20	20	20	20
512-665	7	10	14	17	18	20	20	20	20	20
666-863	7	10	14	17	19	20	20	20	20	20
864-1123	8	12	15	17	19	20	20	20	20	20
1124-1460	8	12	15	17	19	20	20	20	20	20
1461-1898	8	13	15	18	19	20	20	20	20	20
1899-2467	8	14	16	18	20	20	20	20	20	20
>2467	8	14	16	18	20	20	20	20	20	20

**Total Size Score (Social Component)****19**

**2.8 ABORIGINAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUES**

Either or both Aboriginal or Cultural Values may be scored. However, the maximum score permitted for 2.8 is 30 points. Attach documentation.

**2.8.1 ABORIGINAL VALUES**

Full documentation of sources must be attached to the data record.

1) Significant		=	30 points
2) Not Significant		=	0
3) Unknown	X	=	0
Total:	0		

**2.8.2 CULTURAL HERITAGE**

1) Significant		=	30 points
2) Not Significant		=	0
3) Unknown	X	=	0
Total:	0		

**Aboriginal Values/Cultural Heritage Score (maximum 30 points)**

**0**

### 3.0 HYDROLOGICAL COMPONENT

#### 3.1 FLOOD ATTENUATION

If the wetland is a complex including isolated wetlands, apportion the 100 points according to area. For example if 10 ha of a 100 ha complex is isolated, the isolated portion receives the maximum proportional score of 10. The remainder of the wetland is then evaluated out of 90.

**Step 1:** If wetland is entirely Isolated, go directly to Step 5.

If wetland is lacustrine and the ratio of wetland area: lake area is <0.1, or wetland is riverine on the St. Mary's River, go to Step 5

All other wetlands, go through steps 2, 3, 4 and 5.

**Step 2: Determination of Upstream Detention Factor (DF)**

(a)	Wetland area (ha)	<u>696.52</u>
(b)	Total area (ha) of <u>upstream</u> detention areas (include the wetland itself)	<u>710.96</u>
(c)	Ratio of (a):(b)	<u>0.98</u>
(d)	Upstream detention factor: (c) x 2 = <u>1.96</u> (maximum allowable factor = 1)	<u>1.00</u>

**Step 3: Determination of Peak Flow Attenuation Factor (AF)**

(a)	Wetland area (ha)	<u>696.52</u>
(b)	Size of catchment basin (ha) <u>upstream</u> of wetland (include wetland itself in catchment area)	<u>2198.44</u>
(c)	Ratio of (a):(b)	<u>0.32</u>
(d)	Wetland attenuation factor: (c) x 10 = <u>3.2</u> (maximum allowable factor = 1)	<u>1.00</u>

**Step 4: Determination of Wetland Surface Form Factor (FF)**

From the list below, select the surface form which best describes the wetland.

Flooded with little or no aquatic vegetation	Factor <u>          </u> 0
Flooded but with submergent, emergent or floating vegetation	<u>          </u> 0.2
Flat (lawn) vegetation (typical of fens)	<u>          </u> 0.5
Hummock-depression microtopography	<u>      X</u> 0.7
Patterned (e.g., string bog, ribbed fen)	<u>          </u> 1
Surface Form Factor (FF)	<u>          </u> 0.7

(Maximum allowable factor = 1)



**Step 5:**

- 1. Wetland is entirely Isolated 100 points
- 2. Wetland is lacustrine and the ratio of wetland area: lake area is <0.1 0 points
- 3. Wetland is riverine along the St. Mary's River 0 points
- 4. For all other wetlands\*, calculate as follows:
  - a) Upstream Detention Factor (DF) (Step 2) 1.00
  - b) Wetland Attenuation Factor (AF) (Step 3) 1.00
  - c) Surface Form Factor (FF) (Step 4) 0.70

$[(DF + AF + FF)/3] \times 100^*$  90

\*Unless wetland is a complex including isolated portions -- see above

**Total Flood Attenuation Score (maximum 100 points)** 90

**3.2 GROUND WATER RECHARGE**

**3.2.1 SITE TYPE**

- (a) Wetland > 50% lacustrine (by area) or located on the St. Mary's River Score = 0
- (b) Wetland not as above. Calculate final score as follows:  
(FA= area of site type/total area of wetland)
 

0.83	FA of isolated or palustrine wetland	x 20 =	16.60
0.15	FA of riverine wetland	x 5 =	0.75
0.02	FA of lacustrine wetland (wetland <50% lacustrine)	x 0 =	0.00

**Site Type Score: (maximum 20 points)** 17

**3.2.2 SOILS**

**EVALUATION:**

Dominant Wetland Type	Sand, loam, gravel, till		Clay or bedrock	
Lacustrine or on St. Mary's River	0		0	
Isolated	10		5	
Palustrine	7	X	4	
Riverine (not on St. Mary's River)	5		2	
<b>Totals</b>		<b>7</b>		<b>0</b>

**Hydrological Soil Class Score (maximum 10 points)** 7

**3.3 DOWNSTREAM WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT****3.3.1 WATERSHED IMPROVEMENT FACTOR**

Calculation of Watershed Improvement Score is based upon the fractional area (FA) of each site type within the wetland. FA = area of site type/total area of the wetland.

<u>Site Type</u>	<u>Improvement Factor (IF)</u>				
Isolated	FA	<u>0</u>	x	0.5 =	<u>0.00</u>
Riverine	FA	<u>0.15</u>	x	1 =	<u>0.15</u>
Palustrine with no inflow	FA	<u>0</u>	x	0.7 =	<u>0.00</u>
Palustrine with inflows	FA	<u>0.83</u>	x	1 =	<u>0.83</u>
Lacustrine on lake shoreline	FA	<u>0.02</u>	x	0.2 =	<u>0.004</u>
Lacustrine at lake inflow or outflow	FA	<u>0</u>	x	1 =	<u>0.00</u>
<b>Watershed Improvement Score (IF x 30) (maximum = 30)</b>					<b>29.52</b>

**3.3.2 ADJACENT AND WATERSHED LAND USE****EVALUATION****Step 1: Determination of Maximum Initial Score**

Wetland on the Great Lakes or St. Mary's River (Go to Step 5a)

All other wetlands (Go through steps 2, 3, 4 and 5b)

**Step 2: Determination of Broad Upslope Land Use (BLU)**

Assess broad upslope land uses within the previous 5 years, agriculture, or other activities which alter the natural vegetation cover in an extensive manner.

Choose one	Score
>50% of catchment basin	20
20-50% of catchment basin	14
<20% of catchment basin	4
X	
<b>Score for BLU</b>	
	<b>4</b>

**Step 3: Determination of Linear Upslope Land Uses (LUU)**

Assess linear upslope uses (LUU) e.g., roads, railways, hydro corridors, pipelines, etc., crossing the upslope catchment within 200m of the wetland boundary.

Choose the highest only	Score
Major corridor*	15
Secondary corridor	11
Tertiary corridor	6
Temporary or abandoned	3
None	0
X	
<b>Score for LUU</b>	
	<b>6</b>

Major, secondary and tertiary roads are those that are indicated as such on the provincial highways maps. Major hydro corridors are trunk lines coming directly from a generating station. Major pipelines are trans-continental lines. Secondary corridors are regional distribution lines (i.e. multi-cable hydro corridors not emanating directly from a generating station or regional gas distribution lines). Tertiary corridors are single hydro lines or local gas distribution lines (i.e. to domestic users).

**Step 4: Determination of Point-source Land Use (PS)**

Assess point source (PS) land uses producing industrial effluents such as heavy industry, pulp and paper plants, major aggregate operations (but not small pits use for local road construction), etc. Score as present' only if a point source land use is located less than 1km upstream from the wetland.

		Score	
Present		15	
Not present	X	0	
			<b>Score for PS</b> <span style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</span>

**Step 5: Calculation of total score for Adjacent and Watershed Land Use**

- a) Wetland on the Great Lakes or St. Mary's River
- b) All other wetlands, calculate as follows:

**Final Score BLU+LUU+PS** 10

**3.3.3 VEGETATION FORM**

Choose the category that best describes the vegetation of the wetland

Trees, shrubs or herbs (h, c, ts, ls, gc)	X	Score
Emergents, submergents (ne, re, be, f, ff, su)		8 points
Little or no vegetation (u)		10
		0

**Dominant Vegetation Form Score (maximum 10 points)** 8

**3.4 CARBON SINK**

Choose the category that best describes the wetland

- |  |   |           |
|--|---|-----------|
| 1) Wetland a bog or fen with >50% organic soils  |   | 15 points |
| 2) Wetland has organic soils occupying 10 to 50% of the area (i.e. mainly mineral or undesignated soils, any wetland type) |   | 6         |
| 3) Marshes and swamps with >50% organic soil   | X | 9         |
| 4) Wetland with less than 10% of soils organic   |   | 0         |

**Carbon Sink Score (maximum 15 points)** 9

**3.5 SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL**

From the wetland vegetation map determine the dominant vegetation type within the erosion zone for lacustrine and riverine site type areas only. Score according to the factors listed below.

**Step 1:**

Score

	Wetland entirely isolated or palustrine	0
X	Any part of the Wetland riverine or lacustrine (proceed to Step 2)	

**Step 2:**

Choose the one characteristic that best describes the shoreline vegetation (see text for a definition of shoreline)

Score

1)		Trees and shrubs	15
2)	X	Emergent vegetation	8
3)		Submergent vegetation	6
4)		Other shoreline vegetation	3
5)		No vegetation	0

**Shoreline Erosion Control Score (maximum 15 points)**

8

**3.6 GROUNDWATER DISCHARGE**

(Circle the characteristics that best describe the wetland being evaluated and then sum the scores)

Category	Catchment Interaction				
Wetland type	Bog = 0		Swamp/Marsh = 2	2	Fen = 5
Basin topography	Flat/Rolling = 5	5	Hilly = 2		Major relief break = 5
Wetland area: Upslope catchment area	Large (>50%) = 0		Moderate (6-50%) = 2	2	Small (<5%) = 5
Lagg Development	None found = 0	0	Minor = 2		Extensive = 5
Seeps at wetland edge	None found = 0	0	1-3 seeps = 5		4 or more seeps = 10
Iron precipitates evident at edge	None = 0	0	1-3 deposits = 2		4 or more deposits = 5
Surface marl deposits	None = 0	0	1-3 deposits = 2		>3 = 5
Wetland pH	Low < 4.2 = 0		Moderate 4.2-5.7 = 5		High >5.7 = 10
Catchment soil coverage	Patchy = 0		Thin (<20cm) = 2		Thick = 5
Catchment soil permeability	Low = 0		Moderate = 2	2	High = 5
Totals		5		6	15

(Scores are cumulative maximum score 30 points)

**Groundwater Discharge Score (maximum 30 points)**

26

**4.0 SPECIAL FEATURES COMPONENT**

**4.1 RARITY**

**4.1.1 WETLANDS**

Hills Site Region and Site District (5E only): \_\_\_\_\_

Wetland type (check one or more)

- \_\_\_\_\_ Bog
- \_\_\_\_\_ Fen
- X     Swamp
- X     Marsh

Evaluation Table for Scoring Rarity of Wetland Type.

Unit Number	Site Region & District	Marsh	Swamp	Fen	Bog
2E	James Bay	20	20	0	20
2W	Big Trout Lake	20	20	0	10
3E	Lake Abitibi	20	20	10	0
3W	Lake Nipigon	20	20	10	0
3S	Lake St. Joseph	20	20	10	0
4E	Lake Temagami	20	20	10	0
4W	Pigeon River	20	10	20	0
4S	Wabigoon Lake	20	10	20	0
5E-1	Thessalon	10	0	30	20
5E-2	Gore Bay	20	0	20	20
5E-3	La Cloche	20	0	30	20
5E-4	Sudbury	10	0	30	10
5E-5	North Bay	10	0	20	0
5E-6	Tomiko	10	0	20	0
5E-7	Parry Sound	20	0	30	20
5E-8	Huntsville	20	0	30	20
5E-9	Algonquin Park	10	0	30	0
5E-10	Brent	20	0	30	0
5E-11	Bancroft	0	10	30	10
5E-12	Renfrew	0	0	30	10
5E-13	Batchewana	10	0	10	30
5-S	Lake of the Woods	10	10	20	10

X

**Rarity of Wetland Type Score (maximum 70 points)**

40



**4.1.2 SPECIES**

**4.1.2.1 BREEDING HABITAT FOR AN ENDANGERED SPECIES**

	Name of species		Source of information
1)	_____		_____
2)	_____		_____
3)	_____		_____
4)	_____		_____
5)	_____		_____
Total:		0	

Attach documentation.

Scoring:

- For one species                      250 points
- For each additional species      250 points

(score is cumulative, no maximum score)

**Breeding Habitat for Endangered Species Score (no maximum)**

0

**4.1.2.2 TRADITIONAL MIGRATION OR FEEDING HABITAT FOR AN ENDANGERED SPECIES**

	Name of species		Source of information
1)	_____		_____
2)	_____		_____
3)	_____		_____
4)	_____		_____
5)	_____		_____
Total:		0	

Attach documentation.

Scoring:

- For one species                      150 points
- For each additional species      75

(score is cumulative, no maximum score)

**Traditional Habitat for Endangered Species Score (no maximum)**

0

4.1.2.3 PROVINCIALY SIGNIFICANT ANIMAL SPECIES

Name of species	Source of information
1) _____	_____
2) _____	_____
3) _____	_____
4) _____	_____
5) _____	_____
6) _____	_____
7) _____	_____
8) _____	_____
9) _____	_____
10) _____	_____
11) _____	_____
12) _____	_____
13) _____	_____
14) _____	_____
15) _____	_____

Attach separate list if necessary; Attach documentation

Scoring:

Number of provincially significant animal species in the wetland:

1 species = 50 points	14 species = 154
2 species = 80	15 species = 156
3 species = 95	16 species = 158
4 species = 105	17 species = 160
5 species = 115	18 species = 162
6 species = 125	19 species = 164
7 species = 130	20 species = 166
8 species = 135	21 species = 168
9 species = 140	22 species = 170
10 species = 143	23 species = 172
11 species = 146	24 species = 174
12 species = 149	25 species = 176
13 species = 152	

Add one point for every species past 25 (for example, 26 species = 177 points, 27 species = 178 points etc.)

(no maximum score)

**Provincially Significant Animal Species Score (no maximum)**

**0**

4.1.2.4 PROVINCIALY SIGNIFICANT PLANT SPECIES

(Scientific names must be recorded)

Common Name	Scientific Name	Source of information
1) _____	_____	_____
2) _____	_____	_____
3) _____	_____	_____
4) _____	_____	_____
5) _____	_____	_____
6) _____	_____	_____
7) _____	_____	_____
8) _____	_____	_____
9) _____	_____	_____
10) _____	_____	_____
11) _____	_____	_____
12) _____	_____	_____
13) _____	_____	_____
14) _____	_____	_____
15) _____	_____	_____

Attach separate list if necessary; Attach documentation

Scoring:

Number of provincially significant plant species in the wetland:

1 species	= 50 points	14 species	= 154
2 species	= 80	15 species	= 156
3 species	= 95	16 species	= 158
4 species	= 105	17 species	= 160
5 species	= 115	18 species	= 162
6 species	= 125	19 species	= 164
7 species	= 130	20 species	= 166
8 species	= 135	21 species	= 168
9 species	= 140	22 species	= 170
10 species	= 143	23 species	= 172
11 species	= 146	24 species	= 174
12 species	= 149	25 species	= 176
13 species	= 152		

Add one point for every species past 25 (for example, 26 species = 177 points, 27 species = 178 points etc.)

**Provincially Significant Plant Species Score (no maximum)**

**0**

4.1.2.5 REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT SPECIES (SITE REGION)

Scientific names must be recorded for plant species. **Lists of significant species must be approved by MNR.**

**SIGNIFICANT IN SITE REGION:**

	Common Name	Scientific Name	Source of information
1)	eastern phoebe	Sayornis phoebe	NRSI field work
2)	gray catbird	Dumetella carolinensis	NRSI field work
3)	northern cardinal	Cardinalis cardinalis	NRSI field work
4)	sandhill crane	Grus canadensis	NRSI field work
5)	scarlet tanager	Piranga olivacea	NRSI field work
6)			
7)			
8)			
9)			
10)			
11)			
12)			
13)			
14)			
15)			

Attach separate list if necessary. Attach documentation.

\*\* Score only if there is an approved list

Scoring:

No. of species significant in Site Region

1 species	=	20	6 species	=	55
2 species	=	30	7 species	=	58
3 species	=	40	8 species	=	61
4 species	=	45	9 species	=	64
5 species	=	50	10 species	=	67

Add one point for every species past 10 (no maximum score).

**Significant Species (Site Region) Score (no maximum)**

**50**

4.2.1.6 LOCALLY SIGNIFICANT SPECIES (SITE DISTRICT)

Scientific names must be recorded for plant species. **Lists of significant species must be approved by MNR.**

	Common Name	Scientific Name	Source of information
1	_____	_____	_____
2	_____	_____	_____
3	_____	_____	_____
4	_____	_____	_____
5	_____	_____	_____
6	_____	_____	_____
7	_____	_____	_____
8	_____	_____	_____
9	_____	_____	_____
10	_____	_____	_____
11	_____	_____	_____
12	_____	_____	_____
13	_____	_____	_____
14	_____	_____	_____
15	_____	_____	_____
16	_____	_____	_____
17	_____	_____	_____
18	_____	_____	_____

Attach separate list if necessary. Attach documentation.

Scoring:

No. of species significant in Site District

1 species	=	10	6 species	=	41
2 species	=	17	7 species	=	43
3 species	=	24	8 species	=	45
4 species	=	31	9 species	=	47
5 species	=	38	10 species	=	49

For each significant species over 10 in the wetland, add 1 point.

**Locally Significant Species (Site District) Score (no maximum)**

**0**



**4.1.2.7 SPECIES OF SPECIAL STATUS**

**Black Duck**

Suitable breeding habitat present and within assessment range (Figure 17)

Assessment Category	Check one	Score
40-80 Indicated Pairs/100 km sq	<input type="checkbox"/>	25 points
20-40 Indicated Pairs/100 km sq	<input type="checkbox"/>	20
10-20 Indicated Pairs/100 km sq	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15
5-10 Indicated Pairs/100 km sq	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
1-5 Indicated Pairs/100 km sq	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
Habitat not suitable	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
Out of assessment range	<input type="checkbox"/>	0

**Black Duck Score (maximum 25 points)** **15**

**4.2 SIGNIFICANT FEATURES AND/OR FISH & WILDLIFE HABITAT**

**4.2.1 NESTING OF COLONIAL WATERBIRDS**

Status	Name of species	Source of Information	Score
Currently nesting			50 points
Known to have nested within past 5 years			25
Active feeding area (great blue heron excluded)			15
None known			0
	X		

Attach documentation (nest locations etc., if known)

**Colonial Waterbirds Score (maximum 50 points)** **0**

**4.2.2. WINTER COVER FOR WILDLIFE**

(Check only highest level of significance)	Score (one only)
1) <input type="checkbox"/> Provincially significant	100
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Significant in Site Region	50
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Significant in Site District	25
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Locally significant	10
4) <input type="checkbox"/> Little or poor winter cover present	0

Source of information: \_\_\_\_\_

**Winter Cover for Wildlife Score (maximum 100 points)** **0**

**4.2.3 WATERFOWL STAGING AND/OR MOULTING**

(Check only highest level of significance for both staging and moulting; score is cumulative across columns, maximum score 150)

	Staging	Score (one only)	Moulting	Score (one only)
1) Nationally significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	150	<input type="checkbox"/>	150
2) Provincially significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	100	<input type="checkbox"/>	100
3) Regionally significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	50	<input type="checkbox"/>	50
4) Known to occur	<input type="checkbox"/>	10	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
5) Not possible	<input type="checkbox"/>	0	<input type="checkbox"/>	0
6) Not known	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0
Total:			<b>0</b>	

Source of information:

**Waterfowl Moulting and Staging Score (maximum 150 points)**

**0**

**4.2.4 WATERFOWL BREEDING**

	(Check only highest level of significance)	Score
1) Provincially significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	100
2) Regionally significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	50
3) Habitat suitable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10
4) Habitat not suitable	<input type="checkbox"/>	0

Source of information:

field work

**Waterfowl Breeding Score (maximum 100 points)**

**10**

**4.2.5 MIGRATOR PASSERINE, SHOREBIRD OR RAPTOR STOPOVER AREA**

	(check highest applicable category)	Score
1) Provincially significant	<input type="checkbox"/>	100
2) Significant in Site Region	<input type="checkbox"/>	50
3) Significant in Site District	<input type="checkbox"/>	10
4) Not significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	0

Source of information:

**Passerine, Shorebird or Raptor Stopover Score (maximum 100 points)**

**0**

**4.2.6 UNGULATE HABITAT**

**EVALUATION**

Score (1) + (2) + one of (3) to (6)

		Score
(1)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ungulate summer cover	15 points
(2)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mineral licks	50
(3)	<input type="checkbox"/> Moose aquatic feeding area Class 1	0
(4)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Moose aquatic feeding area Class 2	10
(5)	<input type="checkbox"/> Moose aquatic feeding area Class 3	20
(6)	<input type="checkbox"/> Moose aquatic feeding area Class 4	35

(Score is cumulative for a maximum possible score of 100)

**Ungulate Habitat Score (maximum 100 points)**

**25**

**4.2.6 FISH HABITAT**

**4.2.6. Spawning and Nursery Habitat**

**Table 5. Area Factors for Low Marsh, High Marsh, and Swamp Communities.**

No. of ha of Fish Habitat	Area Factor
< 0.5 ha	0.1
0.5- 4.9	0.2
5.0- 9.9	0.4
10.0- 14.9	0.6
15.0 -19.9	0.8
20.0+ ha	1.0

**Step 1:**

Fish habitat is not present within the wetland (Score = 0)

Fish habitat is present within the wetland (Go to Step 2)

**Step 2:**

Choose only one option

1)  Significance of the spawning and nursery habitat within the wetland is known (Go to Step 3)

2)  Significance of the spawning and nursery habitat within the wetland is not known (Go through Steps 4, 5, 6 and 7)

**Step 3:** Select the highest appropriate category below attach documentation:

- 1)  Significant in Site Region 100 points
- 2)  Significant in Site District 50
- 3)  Locally Significant Habitat (5.0+ ha) 25
- 4)  Locally Significant Habitat (<5.0 ha) 15

**Score for Spawning and Nursery Habitat (maximum score 100 points)**

0

**Step 4:** Proceed to Steps 4 to 7 only if Step 3 was not answered.

(**Low Marsh:** marsh area from the existing water line out to the outer boundary of the wetland)

Low marsh not present (Continue to Step 5)

Low marsh present (Score as follows)

**Scoring for Presence of Key Vegetation Groups**

Scoring is based on the one most clearly dominant plant species of the dominant form in each Low Marsh vegetation community. Check the appropriate Vegetation Group (see Appendix 16) for each Low Marsh community. Sum the areas of the communities assigned to each Vegetation Group and multiply by the appropriate size factor from Table 5.

Vegetation Group Number	Vegetation Group Name	Present as a Dominant Form (check)	Total Area (ha)	Area Factor (see Table 5)	Score	Final Score (area factor x score)
1	Tallgrass				6 pts	0.0
2	Shortgrass-Sedge				11	0.0
3	Cattail-Bulrush-Burreed				5	0.0
4	Arrowhead-Pickerelweed				5	0.0
5	Duckweed				2	0.0
6	Smartweed-Waterwillow				6	0.0
7	Waterlily-Lotus				11	0.0
8	Waterweed-Watercress				9	0.0
9	Ribbongrass				10	0.0
10	Coontail-Naiad-Watermilfoil				13	0.0
11	Narrowleaf Pondweed				5	0.0
12	Broadleaf Pondweed				8	0.0
<b>Total Score (maximum 75 points)</b>						<b>0.0</b>

**Step 5:** (High Marsh: area from the water line to the inland boundary of marsh wetland type. This is essentially what is commonly referred to as a wet meadow, in that there is insufficient standing water to provide fisheries habitat except during flood or high water conditions.)

High marsh not present (Continue to Step 6)

High marsh present (Score as follows)

**Scoring for Presence of Key Vegetation Groups**

Scoring is based on the one most clearly dominant plant species of the dominant form in each High Marsh vegetation community. Check the appropriate Vegetation Group for each High Marsh community. Sum the areas of the communities assigned to each Vegetation Group and multiply by the appropriate size factor from Table 5.

Vegetation Group Number	Vegetation Group Name	Present as a Dominant Form (check)	Total Area (ha)	Area Factor (see Table 5)	Score	Final Score (area factor x score)
1	Tallgrass				6 pts	0.0
2	Shortgrass-Sedge	X	10.84	0.6	11	6.6
3	Cattail-Bulrush-Burreed				5	0.0
4	Arrowhead-Pickerelweed				5	0.0
Total Score (maximum 25 points)						6.6

**Step 6:** (Swamp: Swamp communities containing fish habitat, either seasonally or permanently. Determine the total area of seasonally flooded swamps and permanently flooded swamps containing fish habitat.)

Swamp containing fish habitat not present (Continue to Step 7)

Swamp containing fish habitat present (Score as follows)

Swamp containing fish Habitat	Present (check)	Total area (ha)	Area Factor (see Table 5)	Score	TOTAL SCORE (factor x score)
Seasonally flooded				10	0.0
Permanently flooded				10	0.0
SCORE (maximum 20 points)					0.0

**Step 7:** Calculation of final score

Score for Spawning and Nursery Habitat (Low Marsh) (maximum 75)	=	<u>0.0</u>
Score for Spawning and Nursery Habitat (High Marsh) (maximum 25)	=	<u>6.6</u>
Score for Swamp Containing Fish Habitat (maximum 20)	=	<u>0.0</u>

**Sum (maximum score 100 points) =** 6.6

4.2.6.2 Migration and Staging Habitat

**Step 1:**

- 1)        Staging or Migration Habitat is not present in the wetland (Score = 0)
- 2)        Staging or Migration Habitat is present in the wetland significance of the habitat is known (Go to Step 2)
- 3)   X   Staging or Migration Habitat is present in the wetland significance of the habitat is not known (Go to Step 3)

**NOTE: Only one of Step 2 or Step 3 is to be scored.**

**Step 2:** Select the highest appropriate category below, attach documentation:

	Score
1) <u>      </u> Significant in Site Region	25 points
2) <u>      </u> Significant in Site District	15
3) <u>      </u> Locally Significant	10
4) <u>      </u> Fish staging and/or migration habitat present, but not as above	5

**Score for Fish Migration and Staging Habitat (maximum score 25 points)** 0

**Step 3:** Select the highest appropriate category below based on presence of the designated site type (does not have to be dominant). Note name of river for 2) and 3).

	Score
1) <u>  X  </u> Wetland is riverine at rivermouth or lacustrine at rivermouth	25 points
2) <u>      </u> Wetland is riverine, within 0.75 km of rivermouth	15
3) <u>      </u> Wetland is lacustrine, within 0.75 km of rivermouth	10
4) <u>      </u> Fish staging and/or migration habitat present, but not as above	5

**Score for Staging and Migration Habitat (maximum score 25 points)** 25



**4.3 ECOSYSTEM AGE**

(Fractional Area = area of wetland type/total area of wetland)

	Fractional Area			Scoring
Bog		x	25 =	0.0
Fen, treed to open on deep soils floating mats or marl		x	20 =	0.0
Fen, on limestone rock		x	5 =	0.0
Swamp	0.87	x	3 =	2.6
Marsh	0.13	x	0 =	0.0
		Sub Total:		2.6
<b>Ecosystem Age Score (maximum 25 points)</b>				<b>2.6</b>

**4.4 GREAT LAKES COASTAL WETLANDS****Score for coastal (see text for definition) wetlands only**

Choose one only

wetland < 10 ha	=	0 points
wetland 10- 50 ha	=	25
wetland 51 -100 ha	=	50
wetland > 100 ha	=	75

**Great Lakes Coastal Wetlands Score (maximum 75 points)****0**

**5.0 EXTRA INFORMATION****5.1 PURPLE LOOSESTRIFE** Absent/Not seen Present(a) One location in wetland \_\_\_\_\_  
Two to many locations \_\_\_\_\_

Abundance code

(b) (1 < 20 plants) \_\_\_\_\_  
(2 20-99 plants) \_\_\_\_\_  
(3 100-999 plants) \_\_\_\_\_  
(4 >1000 plants) \_\_\_\_\_**5.2 SEASONALLY FLOODED AREAS**

Indicate length of seasonal flooding

Check one or more

Ephemeral (less than 2 weeks) \_\_\_\_\_  
Temporal (2 weeks to 1 month) \_\_\_\_\_  
Seasonal (1 to 3 months)  \_\_\_\_\_  
Semi-permanent (>3 months) \_\_\_\_\_  
No seasonal flooding \_\_\_\_\_**5.3 SPECIES OF SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE****5.3.1 Osprey**Present and nesting (attach map showing nest site) \_\_\_\_\_  
Known to have nested in last 5 yr \_\_\_\_\_  
Feeding area for osprey  \_\_\_\_\_  
Not as above \_\_\_\_\_**5.3.2 Common Loon**Nesting in wetland (attach map showing nest site) \_\_\_\_\_  
Feeding at edge of wetland \_\_\_\_\_  
Observed or heard on lake or  
river adjoining the wetland  \_\_\_\_\_  
Not as above \_\_\_\_\_

**INVESTIGATORS**

**AFFILIATION**

David Stephenson

Natural Resource Solutions Inc.

Charlotte Moore

Natural Resource Solutions Inc.

Jessica Grealey

Natural Resource Solutions Inc.

Katharina Walton

Natural Resource Solutions Inc.

Megan Pope

Natural Resource Solutions Inc.

Tara Brenton

Natural Resource Solutions Inc.

**DATES WETLAND VISITED**

June 21 and 22, 2011

**DATE THIS EVALUATION COMPLETED:**

**February 22, 2012**

**ESTIMATED TIME DEVOTED TO COMPLETING THE FIELD SURVEY IN "PERSON HOURS"**

50 hours

**WEATHER CONDITIONS**

i) at time of field work June 21 morning: 13°C, 70-90% cloud cover, wind – Beaufort scale 0-2  
 June 21 evening: 15°C, 5-15% cloud cover, wind – Beaufort scale 2-4  
 June 22: 10-24°C, 10-100% cloud cover, wind – Beaufort scale 2-4

ii) summer conditions in general spring: wet, cool; summer: hot, dry

**OTHER POTENTIALLY USEFUL INFORMATION:**

Surveys completed by Natural Resource Solutions Inc.:  
 vegetation, breeding birds, nocturnal birds, anuran call surveys

**CHECKLIST OF PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES RECORDED IN THE WETLAND:**

Attach a list of all flora and fauna observed in the wetland.

\*Indicate if voucher specimens or photos have been obtained, where located, etc.

## WETLAND EVALUATION SCORING RECORD

WETLAND NAME

Abitibi-Martin's Meadow-Empire Wetland Complex

1.0 BIOLOGICAL COMPONENT1.1 PRODUCTIVITY

1.1.1 Growing Degree-Days/Soils	11
1.1.2 Wetland Type	9
1.1.3 Site Type	2

Total for Productivity **22**1.2 BIODIVERSITY

1.2.1 Number of Wetland Types	13
1.2.2 Vegetation Communities (maximum 45)	13
1.2.3 Diversity of Surrounding Habitat (maximum 7)	7
1.2.4 Proximity to Other Wetlands	8
1.2.5 Interspersion	24
1.2.6 Open Water Type	8

Total for Biodiversity **73**Sub Total for Biodiversity **73**1.3 SIZE (Biological Component) **37****TOTAL FOR BIOLOGICAL COMPONENT (not to exceed 250)** **132**

## 2.0 SOCIAL COMPONENT

2.1 ECONOMICALLY VALUABLE PRODUCTS

2.1.1 Wood Products	14
2.1.2 Lowbush Cranberry	0
2.1.3 Wild Rice	10
2.1.4 Commercial Fish	12
2.1.6 Furbearers	12

Total for Economically Valuable Products	48
--	----

2.2 <u>RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES (maximum 80)</u>	16
---	----

2.3 LANDSCAPE AESTHETICS

2.3.1 Distinctness	0
2.3.2 Absence of Human Disturbance	4

Total for Landscape Aesthetics	4
--------------------------------	---

2.4 EDUCATION AND PUBLIC AWARENESS

2.4.1 Educational Uses	0
2.4.2 Facilities and Programs	0
2.4.3 Research and Studies (maximum 12)	0

Total for Education and Public Awareness	0
--	---

2.5 <u>PROXIMITY TO AREAS OF HUMAN SETTLEMENT</u>	16
---	----

2.6 <u>OWNERSHIP</u>	4
----------------------	---

Subtotal for Social Component	80
-------------------------------	----

2.7 <u>SIZE</u> (Social Component)	19
------------------------------------	----

2.8 <u>ABORIGINAL AND CULTURAL VALUES</u> (maximum 30)	0
--	---

<u>TOTAL FOR SOCIAL COMPONENT (not to exceed 250)</u>	107
---	-----

3.0 HYDROLOGICAL COMPONENT

3.1 <u>FLOOD ATTENUATION</u>		90
3.2 <u>GROUNDWATER RECHARGE</u>		
3.2.1 Site Type	17	
3.2.2 Soils	7	
	Total for Groundwater Recharge	24
3.3 <u>WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT</u>		
3.3.1 Watershed Improvement Factor	30	
3.3.2 Adjacent and Watershed Land Use	10	
3.3.3 Vegetation Form	8	
	Total for Water Quality Improvement	48
3.4 <u>CARBON SINK</u>		9
3.5 <u>SHORELINE EROSION CONTROL</u>		8
3.6 <u>GROUNDWATER DISCHARGE</u>		26
	<u>TOTAL FOR HYDROLOGICAL COMPONENT (not to exceed 250)</u>	205



4.0 SPECIAL FEATURES4.1 RARITY

4.1.1 Wetlands		40
4.1.2 Species		
4.1.2.1 Endangered or Threatened Species Breeding	0	
4.1.2.2 Traditional Use by Endangered or Threatened Species	0	
4.1.2.3 Provincially Significant Animals	0	
4.1.2.4 Provincially Significant Plants	0	
4.1.2.5 Regionally Significant Species	50	
4.1.2.6 Locally Significant Species	0	
4.1.2.7 Species of Special Status	0	
Total for Species Rarity		50

4.2 SIGNIFICANT FEATURES OR HABITAT

4.2.1 Colonial Waterbirds	0	
4.2.2 Winter Cover for Wildlife	0	
4.2.3 Waterfowl Staging and Moulting	0	
4.2.4 Waterfowl Breeding	10	
4.2.5 Migratory Passerine, Shorebird or Raptor Stopover	0	
4.2.6 Ungulate Habitat	25	
4.2.7 Fish Habitat	32	
Total for Significant Features and Habitat		67

4.3 ECOSYSTEM AGE 34.4 GREAT LAKES COASTAL WETLANDS 0

TOTAL FOR SPECIAL FEATURES (maximum 250) 159

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION RESULT

Wetland	Abitibi-Martin's Meadow-Empire Wetland Complex
TOTAL FOR 1.0 BIOLOGICAL COMPONENT	132
TOTAL FOR 2.0 SOCIAL COMPONENT	107
TOTAL FOR 3.0 HYDROLOGICAL COMPONENT	205
TOTAL FOR 4.0 SPECIAL FEATURES COMPONENT	159
	<u>WETLAND TOTAL</u>
	603

INVESTIGATORS

David Stephenson
Charlotte Moore
Jessica Grealey
Katharina Walton
Megan Pope
Tara Brenton

AFFILIATION

Natural Resource Solutions Inc.
---------------------------------

DATE

February 22, 2012
-------------------

Species Observed		Vegetation survey	Amphibian survey	Breeding bird survey	Nocturnal bird survey
<b>Amphibians</b>					
Mink frog	<i>Rana septentrionalis</i>	X			
Spring peeper	<i>Pseudacris crucifer crucifer</i>		X		
Wood frog	<i>Rana sylvatica</i>	(Reported by Hatch)			
<b>Birds</b>					
Alder flycatcher	<i>Empidonax alnorum</i>	X		X	
American crow	<i>Corvus brachyrhynchos</i>	X		X	
American goldfinch	<i>Carduelis tristis</i>	X		X	
American kestrel	<i>Falco sparverius</i>	X			
American redstart	<i>Setophaga ruticilla</i>			X	
American robin	<i>Turdus migratorius</i>	X	X	X	X
Black and white warbler	<i>Mniotilta varia</i>	X		X	
Black-capped chickadee	<i>Poecile atricapillus</i>	X		X	
Black-throated green warbler	<i>Dendroica virens</i>	X		X	
Black-throated blue warbler	<i>Denrioca caerulenscens</i>	X		X	
Blue jay	<i>Cyanocitta cristata</i>			X	
Chestnut-sided warbler	<i>Dendrioca pensylvanica</i>			X	
Common loon	<i>Gavia immer</i>	X		X	
Common yellowthroat	<i>Geothlypis trichas</i>	X		X	
Eastern phoebe	<i>Sayornis phoebe</i>	X		X	
Gray catbird	<i>Dumetella carolinensis</i>			X	
Hermit thrush	<i>Catharus guttatus</i>		X	X	X
Mourning warbler	<i>Oporornis philadelphia</i>			X	
Northern cardinal	<i>Cardinalis cardinalis</i>			X	
Nothern harrier	<i>Circus cyaneus</i>	X			
Ovenbird	<i>Seiurus aurocapillus</i>			X	
Red-eyed vireo	<i>Vireo olivaceus</i>	X		X	
Red-winged blackbird	<i>Agelaius phoeniceus</i>	X		X	
Ring-billed gull	<i>Larus delawarensis</i>	X			
Sandhill crane	<i>Grus canadensis</i>	X	X	X	X
Savannah sparrow	<i>Passerculus sandwichensis</i>			X	
Scarlet tanager	<i>Piranga olivacea</i>			X	
Sharp-shinned hawk	<i>Accipiter striatus</i>	X			
Song sparrow	<i>Melospiza melodia</i>			X	
Tennessee warbler	<i>Vermivora peregrina</i>			X	
Tree swallow	<i>Tachycineta bicolor</i>	X			
Veery	<i>Catharus fuscescens</i>	X	X	X	X
White-breasted nuthatch	<i>Sitta carolinensis</i>	X			
White-throated sparrow	<i>Zonotrichia albicollis</i>	X	X	X	X
Yellow rumped warbler	<i>Dendroica coronata</i>			X	
Yellow warbler	<i>Dendroica petechia</i>	X		X	

Species Observed		Vegetation survey	Amphibian survey	Breeding bird survey	Nocturnal bird survey
<b>Butterflies</b>					
Canadian tiger swallowtail	<i>Papilio canadensis</i>	X			
Common ringlet	<i>Coenonympha tullia</i>	X			
Juvenal's duskywing	<i>Erynnis juvenalis</i>	X			
Northern crescent	<i>Phyciodes pascoensis</i>	X			
White admiral	<i>Limenitis arthemis arthemis</i>	X			
Wild indigo duskywing	<i>Erynnis Baptisiae</i>	X			
<b>Dragonflies and Damers</b>					
Ebony jewelwing	<i>Calopteryx maculata</i>	X			
<b>Mammals</b>					
Beaver	<i>Castor canadensis</i>	X			
Groundhog	<i>Marmota monax</i>	X			
Moose	<i>Alces alces</i>	X		X	
Red fox	<i>Vulpes vulpes</i>			X	X
Red squirrel	<i>Tamiasciurus hudsonicus</i>	X			
White-tailed deer	<i>Odocoileus virginianus</i>	X		X	
<b>Vegetation</b>					
Alder-leaved buckthorn	<i>Rhamnus alnifolia</i>	X			
Aquatic sedge	<i>Carex aquatilis</i>	X			
Awl-fruited sedge	<i>Carex stipata</i>	X			
Balsam fir	<i>Abies balsamea</i>	X			
Balsam poplar	<i>Populus balsamifera ssp. balsamifera</i>	X			
Bebb's willow	<i>Salix bebbiana</i>	X			
Bird's-foot trefoil	<i>Lotus corniculatus</i>	X			
Black spruce	<i>Picea mariana</i>	X			
Black willow	<i>Salix nigra</i>	X			
Blue bells	<i>Campanula rotundifolia</i>	X			
Blue flag iris	<i>Iris versicolor</i>	X			
Bluebead-lily	<i>Clintonia borealis</i>	X			
Bottlebrush sedge	<i>Carex hystericina</i>	X			
Bracken fern	<i>Pteridium aquilinum var. latiusculum</i>	X			
Bristly black currant	<i>Ribes lacustre</i>	X			
Bull thistle	<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>	X			
Bunchberry	<i>Cornus canadensis</i>	X			
Bush honeysuckle	<i>Diervilla lonicera</i>	X			
Canada blue-joint	<i>Calamagrostis canadensis</i>	X			
Canada mayflower	<i>Maianthemum canadense</i>	X			
Canada soapberry	<i>Shepherdia canadensis</i>	X			
Choke cherry	<i>Prunus virginiana ssp. virginiana</i>	X			
Club moss sp.	<i>Lycopodiaceae sp.</i>	X			
Common cattail	<i>Typha latifolia</i>	X			
Common dandelion	<i>Taraxacum officinale</i>	X			
Common hairgrass	<i>Deschampsia flexuosa</i>	X			
Cow parsnip	<i>Heracleum maximum</i>	X			
Cow vetch	<i>Vicia cracca</i>	X			
Curly dock	<i>Rumex crispus</i>	X			

Species Observed		Vegetation survey	Amphibian survey	Breeding bird survey	Nocturnal bird survey
Dark-green bulrush	<i>Scirpus atrovirens</i>	X			
Dwarf raspberry	<i>Rubus pubescens</i>	X			
Early meadowrue	<i>Thalictrum dioicum</i>	X			
European mountain-ash	<i>Sorbus aucuparia</i>	X			
Field horsetail	<i>Equisetum arvense</i>	X			
Fireweed	<i>Chamerion angustifolium</i> spp. <i>angustifolium</i>	X			
Fowl meadow grass	<i>Glyceria striata</i>	X			
Fox sedge	<i>Carex vulpinoidea</i>	X			
Fragrant bedstraw	<i>Galium triflorum</i>	X			
Grasses	<i>Poa</i> spp.	X			
Greater duckweed	<i>Spirodela polyrhiza</i>	X			
Hairy Solomon's seal	<i>Polygonatum biflorum</i>	X			
High bush cranberry	<i>Viburnum trilobum</i>	X			
Kentucky bluegrass	<i>Poa saltuensis</i> ssp. <i>languida</i>	X			
Labrador-tea	<i>Ledum groenlandicum</i>	X			
Lady fern	<i>Athyrium filix-femina</i>	X			
Lettuce sp.	<i>Lactuca</i> sp.	X			
Long-leaved aster	<i>Symphotrichum robynsonianum</i>	X			
Low bush blueberry	<i>Vaccinium angustifolium</i>	X			
Marsh cinquefoil	<i>Comarum palustre</i>	X			
Marsh St. John's-wort	<i>Triadenum virginicum</i>	X			
Marsh-marigold	<i>Caltha palustris</i>	X			
Moss sp.		X			
New England aster	<i>Symphotrichum novae-angliae</i>	X			
Nodding trillium	<i>Trillium cernuum</i>	X			
Northern beech fern	<i>Phegopteris connectilis</i>	X			
Ostrich fern	<i>Matteuccia struthiopteris</i> var. <i>pennsylvanica</i>	X			
Pale jewelweed	<i>Impatiens pallida</i>	X			
Prickly rose	<i>Rosa acicularis</i> ssp. <i>sayi</i>	X			
Red currant	<i>Ribes rubrum</i>	X			
Red maple	<i>Acer rubrum</i>	X			
Red raspberry	<i>Rubus idaeus</i> ssp. <i>idaeus</i>	X			
Red-berried elder	<i>Sambucus racemosa</i> ssp. <i>pubens</i>	X			
Red-osier dogwood	<i>Cornus stolonifera</i>	X			
Reed canary grass	<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	X			
Rough-leaved goldenrod	<i>Solidago patula</i>	X			
Sarsaparilla	<i>Aralia elata</i>	X			
Sedge sp.	<i>Carex</i> sp.	X			
Serviceberry	<i>Amelanchier humilis</i>	X			
Showy mountain ash	<i>Sorbus decora</i>	X			
Small-fruited Bulrush	<i>Scirpus microcarpus</i>	X			
Smooth scouring-rush	<i>Equisetum laevigatum</i>	X			
Speckled alder	<i>Alnus incana</i> spp. <i>rugosa</i>	X			
Spinulose wood fern	<i>Dryopteris carthusiana</i>	X			
Spotted touch-me-not	<i>Impatiens capensis</i>	X			
Star-flower	<i>Trientalis borealis</i> ssp. <i>borealis</i>	X			
Stinging nettle	<i>Urtica dioica</i>	X			
Swamp fly honeysuckle	<i>Lonicera oblongifolia</i>	X			
Tall buttercup	<i>Ranunculus acris</i>	X			

Species Observed		Vegetation survey	Amphibian survey	Breeding bird survey	Nocturnal bird survey
Tall meadow-rue	<i>Thalictrum pubescens</i>	X			
Tamarack	<i>Larix laricina</i>	X			
Trembling aspen	<i>Populus tremuloides</i>	X			
Tufted loosestrife	<i>Lysimachia thyrsoiflora</i>	X			
Tufted vetch	<i>Vicia cracca</i>	X			
White birch	<i>Betula papyrifera</i>	X			
White spruce	<i>Picea glauca</i>	X			
Wild carrot	<i>Daucus carota</i>	X			
Wild mint	<i>Mentha arvensis ssp. borealis</i>	X			
Wild strawberry	<i>Fragaria virginiana</i>	X			
Willow species	<i>Salix species</i>	X			
Wood horsetail	<i>Equisetum sylvaticum</i>	X			
Woodland strawberry	<i>Fragaria vesca ssp. americana</i>	X			
Yellow lady's slipper	<i>Cypridedium calceolus</i>	X			

















Figure 1

# Northland Cochrane Area Solar Projects


## Interspersion Map / Catchment Boundary

### Legend

-  Project Site
-  Project Site 120m Buffer
-  Catchment
-  Wetland
-  Ecological Land Classification
-  Interspersion Grid
-  Highway
-  Primary Road
-  Secondary Road
-  Watercourse (Permanent)
-  Watercourse (Intermittent)
-  Waterbody
-  Watercourse Flow Direction



Map Produced by Natural Resource Solutions Inc. This map is proprietary and confidential and must not be duplicated or distributed by any means without express written permission of NRSI. Source: Data provided by MNR© Copyright: Queen's Printer Ontario

Project: 1247B Date: February-22-12	NAD83 - UTM Zone 17 Scale: 1:17,000 (22x34")
	



**APPENDIX IV**  
**Amphibian Call Survey Field Data Sheets**

---



## Amphibian Data Form

Project: Cochrane Project No. 1247

UTM:

Observer: <u>SEG, cm</u>	Station Name: <u>Abitibi 1</u> Visit #: <u>1</u>	Date: <u>June 21/11</u> Start time: <u>20:08</u>
Wind speed: <u>4</u>	% Cloud cover: <u>5</u>	Air Temp: <u>15°C</u>
Precipitation Description: <u>none</u>		Water Temp: <u>1</u>
Remarks: <u>NOT a good amphibian monitoring site no water, no frog habitat</u>		Water pH: <u>1</u>

direction 180°



CALL LEVEL CODES		Beaufort Wind Scale		
1	Calls can be counted; not simultaneous	0 Calm	0-2	Smoke rises vertically
2	Some simultaneous calls; distinguishable	1 Light air	3-5	Smoke drifts, but wind vanes do not
3	Calls not distinguishable individually overlapping	2 Slight breeze	6-11	Wind felt on face, leaves rustle
Enter as: Call code (# of individuals) e.g. 1 (2)		3 Gentle breeze	12-19	Leaves & small twigs in constant motion; light flags extended
		4 Mod. breeze	20-30	Wind raises dust and loose paper; small branches move
		5 Fresh breeze	31-39	Small trees in leaf begin to sway
		6 Strong breeze	40-50	Large branches in motion; inconvenience felt when walking against wind




## Amphibian Data Form

Project: Cochrane Project No. 247

UTM:

Observer: <u>JEG cm</u>	Station Name: <u>Abiibi 1B</u>	Date: <u>June 21/11</u>
Wind speed: <u>4</u>	Visit #: <u>2</u>	Start time: <u>20:21</u>
% Cloud cover: <u>5</u>	Air Temp: <u>15°C</u>	Water Temp: <u>/</u>
Precipitation Description: <u>none</u>		
Remarks:		

direction 0°



CALL LEVEL CODES		Beaufort Wind Scale	
1	Calls can be counted; not simultaneous	0 Calm	0-2 Smoke rises vertically
2	Some simultaneous calls; distinguishable	1 Light air	3-5 Smoke drifts, but wind vanes do not
3	Calls not distinguishable individually overlapping	2 Slight breeze	6-11 Wind felt on face, leaves rustle
Enter as: Call code (# of individuals) e.g. 1 (2)		3 Gentle breeze	12-19 Leaves & small twigs in constant motion; light flags extended
		4 Mod breeze	20-30 Wind raises dust and loose paper; small branches move
		5 Fresh breeze	31-39 Small trees in leaf begin to sway
		6 Strong breeze	40-50 Large branches in motion; inconvenience felt when walking against wind



## Amphibian Data Form


Project: Cochrane Project No. 1247

UTM:

Observer: <u>JEG cm</u>	Station Name: <u>Abitibi 2</u> Visit #: <u>4</u>	Date: <u>June 21/11</u> Start time: <u>20:29</u>
Wind speed: <u>3</u>	% Cloud cover: <u>1</u>	Air Temp: <u>15°C</u>
Precipitation Description: <u>none</u>		Water Temp: <u>19°C</u>
Water pH: <u>/</u>		
Remarks:		

direction 0°

SPPE (C2)



CALL LEVEL CODES		Beaufort Wind Scale		
1	Calls can be counted; not simultaneous	0 Calm	0-2	Smoke rises vertically
2	Some simultaneous calls; distinguishable	1 Light air	3-5	Smoke drifts, but wind vanes do not
3	Calls not distinguishable individually overlapping	2 Slight breeze	6-11	Wind felt on face, leaves rustle
Enter as: Call code (# of individuals) e.g. 1 (2)		3 Gentle breeze	12-19	Leaves & small twigs in constant motion; light flags extended
		4 Mod breeze	20-30	Wind raises dust and loose paper; small branches move
		5 Fresh breeze	31-39	Small trees in leaf begin to sway
		6 Strong breeze	40-50	Large branches in motion; inconvenience felt when walking against wind

