



**NORTHLAND
POWER**

Crosby Solar Project Consultation Report

April 5, 2011



Northland Power Inc.
on behalf of
Northland Power Solar
Crosby L.P.
Toronto, Ontario

Consultation Report

Crosby Solar Project

H334844-0000-07-124-0345

Rev. 0

April 5, 2011

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. 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 5, 2011

**Northland Power Inc.
Crosby Solar Project**

Consultation Report

Table of Contents

1. Overview	5
1.1 Project Description	5
1.2 Legislative Requirements.....	5
1.3 The Consultation Process	7
2. Consultation with the Public	9
2.1 Methods of Consultation	9
2.2 List of Stakeholders	10
2.3 Details and Results of Consultation	10
2.3.1 First Public Meeting and Notice	10
2.3.2 Final Public Meeting and Notice	11
2.3.3 Other Public Consultation	12
2.4 Public Comments and Concerns	13
3. Consultation with Agencies.....	27
3.1 Agencies	27
3.1.1 Ontario Ministry of Environment	27
3.1.2 Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources.....	28
3.1.3 Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture	29
3.1.4 Rideau Valley Conservation Authority	30
3.1.5 United Counties of Leeds and Grenville	30
3.1.6 Township of Rideau Lakes.....	30
3.1.7 Parks Canada.....	32
3.2 Agency Comments and Concerns.....	32
4. Consultation with Aboriginal Communities.....	37
4.1 Aboriginal Community Consultation List.....	37
4.2 Consultation Activities	37
4.2.1 First Public Meeting and Notice	37
4.2.2 Final Public Meeting and Notice	37
4.3 Other Aboriginal Consultation Activities	38
4.4 Aboriginal Comments and Concerns	40
5. Conclusions.....	43
6. References.....	45

Appendix A	Public Stakeholder List
Appendix B	Notices and Letters
Appendix C	Copies of Display Boards at First Public Meeting
Appendix D	Copies of Display Boards Final Public Meeting
Appendix E	Correspondence with the Public
Appendix F	Correspondence with Agencies
Appendix G	Correspondence with Municipalities
Appendix H	List of Aboriginal Communities from Ministry of the Environment
Appendix I	Letters to Aboriginal Communities
Appendix J	Correspondence with Aboriginal Communities

List of Tables

Table 1.1	Legislative Requirements – Concordance Table.....	6
Table 2.1	Comments/Concerns from Public and Responses	13
Table 3.1	Comments/Concern From Agencies and Responses.....	33
Table 4.1	Details of Additional Consultation Activities.....	38
Table 4.2	Comments/Concerns from Aboriginal Communities and Responses	41

Blank back

1. Overview

1.1 Project Description

Northland Power Solar Crosby L.P. (hereinafter referred to as “Northland”) is proposing to develop a 10-megawatt (MW) solar photovoltaic project titled the Crosby Solar Project (hereinafter referred to as the “Project”). The Project will be located on approximately 52 hectares (ha) of land, located at 249 Little Rideau Lake Road in the Township of Rideau Lakes, within the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville, in Ontario.

1.2 Legislative Requirements

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

Consultation is a requirement of the REA process as stipulated by Sections 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 of REA Regulation. In addition, the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) has prepared draft guidelines called “*Technical Bulletin Five - Guidance for Preparing the Consultation Report*” (MOE, 2010) outlining the Ministry’s expectations and guidelines for appropriate consultation, including the development of a Consultation Report as part of the REA application package. This Consultation Report has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the REA Regulation and the MOE technical bulletin.

It is noted that at the time of submittal of this report, MOE stated that an Aboriginal consultation document, titled “*Aboriginal Consultation Guide for Renewable Energy Projects Governed Under O.Reg. 359/09: Aboriginal Consultation Guide*” was being drafted to be released at a later date, but was not currently publicly available. As a result, the above-mentioned guidance document (Technical Bulletin Five) was used as a reference for meeting Aboriginal consultation requirements.

Table 1 in the REA Regulation requires the Consultation Report to include the following:

- a summary of communications with any members of the public, aboriginal communities, municipalities, local road boards and local services boards regarding the Project
- evidence that the information required to be distributed to aboriginal communities under Subsection 17(1) was distributed
- any information provided by an aboriginal community in response to a request made under paragraph 4 of Subsection 17(1)
- evidence that a consultation form was distributed in accordance with Subsection 18(1)
- the consultation form distributed under Subsection 18(1), if any part of it has been completed by a municipality, local roads board or local services board

- a description of whether and how:
 - ◆ comments from the members of the public, aboriginal communities, municipalities, local roads boards and local service boards were considered by the person who is engaging in the Project
 - ◆ the documents that were made available under Subsection 16(5) were amended after the final public meeting was held
 - ◆ the proposal to engage in the project was altered in response to comments made from members of the public, aboriginal communities, municipalities, local roads boards and local service boards.

The legislative requirements have been documented within this Consultation Report. The information as it relates to legislative requirements is in a concordance table, Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Legislative Requirements – Concordance Table

Requirements	Location Within the Consultation Report
A summary of communications with public, aboriginal communities, and municipalities.	Communications with the public are summarized in Table 2.1 and provided in Appendix E.
	Communications with Aboriginal communities are summarized in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 and provided in Appendixes J and K.
	Communications with municipalities and other Public Agencies are summarized in Table 3.1 and found in Appendixes F and Appendix G.
Evidence that the information required to be distributed to aboriginal communities under Subsection 17(1) was distributed.	Section 4.
Any information provided by an aboriginal community in response to a request made under paragraph 4 of Subsection 17(1).	Section 4 and in Appendix J.
Evidence that a consultation form was distributed in accordance with Subsection 18(1).	Section 3
The consultation form distributed under Subsection 18(1), if any part of it has been completed by a municipality, location roads board or local service boards.	Appendix G.
A description of whether and how <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comments from the members of the public, aboriginal communities, municipalities, local roads boards and local service boards were considered by the person who is engaging in the project • the documents that were made available under Subsection 16(5) were amended after the final public meeting was held, and • the proposal to engage in the project was altered in 	Table 2.1, Table 3.1, Tables 4.1 and 4.2.

response to comments made from members of the public, aboriginal communities, municipalities, local roads boards and local service boards.	
--	--

1.3 The Consultation Process

Pursuant to O. Reg. 359/09, consultation conducted for the Project has included adjacent landowners, government agencies (e.g., Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), MOE, Conservation Authorities, etc, local municipalities (upper and lower tier), aboriginal communities and the public. The objectives of the consultation process have been to obtain information about the Project location, identify issues and potential concerns, and to identify potential impacts associated with the Project and potential means of mitigating those impacts. As well, the consultation process has been used to identify specific stakeholders as a means to establish open and meaningful dialogue between the project Proponent and the stakeholders.

Local road boards and local service roads are not present in the Project area. Therefore, no consultation is possible with such bodies for the Project.

The following report provides:

- an outline and description of all consultation activities held for this Project for the public, government agencies, including municipalities and Aboriginal communities
- a summary of comments from public, government agencies and Aboriginal communities
- a summary of how these comments were incorporated into the REA process.

Blank back

2. Consultation with the Public

2.1 Methods of Consultation

The methods of consultation for the Project include the requirements identified in the REA Regulation, as well as additional measures deemed necessary to ensure adequate consultation with the public. A wide variety of consultation methods increases the amount of public awareness and participation. The methods of consultation for this Project included the following:

- Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project/Notice of Public Meeting
 - ◆ direct mail to all identified landowners within 120 m of the Project location (a full list of landowners is provided in Appendix A). A total of 21 notices were issued on July 20, 2010 for the first public meeting.
 - ◆ posting on two separate occasions on Thursday, July 22, 2010 and Thursday, July 29, 2010 in *The Review Mirror*, which has general circulation in the Project area. These notices are included in Appendix B.
- Notice of Final Public Meeting
 - ◆ direct mail to all identified landowners within 120 m of the Project location (a full list of landowners is provided in Appendix A, as well as interested parties identified through Public Consultation efforts). A total of 44 notices were issued on January 4, 2011 for the final public meeting.
 - ◆ posting on two separate occasions on Thursday, January 6, 2011 and Thursday, February 10, 2011 in *The Smiths Falls EMC*, which has general circulation in the Project area. These notices are included in Appendix B.
- a website (www.northlandpower.ca/crosby) with Project and Northland information, Notices and Project documents posted when available
- hard copies of the Project Description Report and supporting Project documents available for review at the Township of Rideau Lakes municipal office
- first and final public meetings
- additional meetings with community groups and concerned and/or interested local residents
- means to obtain comments on the Project by having comment sheets available at first and final public meetings and advertisement of phone numbers, fax and emails for the public to make comments
- one hardcopy of Draft Project Description Report available at the first public meeting and all the Draft REA project documents available for review at the final public meeting
- handouts (printed copies of boards) available at the public meetings.

Through these methods, information, questions, comments, feedback and concerns regarding the Project were obtained and then utilized and addressed, as discussed in the following sections.

2.2 List of Stakeholders

A list of property owners within 120 m of the Project location was determined through consultation with the Township of Rideau Lakes.

As correspondence was received from members of the public and other organizations regarding the Project, newly identified names and contact details were added to the public mailing list. For example, if any attendees of the first public meeting provided their mailing address, this address was added to the mailing list. Appendix A contains a copy of the public stakeholder list that was used for distribution of the Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project/Notice of Public Meeting and the expanded public stakeholder list that was used for distribution of the Notice of Final Public Meeting.

2.3 Details and Results of Consultation

The following sections provide information on the details of the consultation completed and the results.

It should be noted that between the formalized consultation activities, all stakeholders were encouraged to provide comments or questions via telephone, fax, email or mail at any time during the consultation process. Stakeholders were also encouraged to provide any concerns early in the process. Where relevant, a response was provided for each question or comment received, either directly (i.e., at the public consultation sessions) or through the same medium through which the submission was made. All comments and concerns, responses, and the impact to the Project are provided in this report.

2.3.1 First Public Meeting and Notice

The Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project and Public Meeting was published 30 days prior to the event in the *Review Mirror* on Thursday, July 22, 2010 and again on Thursday, July 29, 2010. The *Review Mirror* is a local paper with weekly publication, circulating from Westport into the surrounding Rideau Lakes township. Notices and covering letter were sent by regular mail to all identified landowners within 120 m of the Project location. A total of 21 stakeholders were mailed a notification on July 20, 2010. The letters are contained in Appendix B along with the Notices published in the *Review Mirror*.

The Notice and Draft Project Description Report (PDR) were posted on the Project website, northlandpower.ca/crosby, at the same time the Notice was published. The PDR was also made available for public review at the Township of Rideau Lakes municipal office 30 days prior to the first public meeting.

The first public meeting was held on Tuesday, August 24, 2010 from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the Crosby Hall (3579 Highway 15, Township of Rideau Lakes) with a purpose to achieve the following:

- introduce Northland and the Project to the community
- identify the Project contacts and avenues for comment or question submission
- solicit feedback on the Draft PDR.

A total of thirty four (34) people signed in at the first public meeting.

Project information was provided on display boards set up at the public meeting and handouts of the display boards were made available to the public. Appendix C contains a copy of the display boards. A paper copy of the PDR was also made available for review at the first public meeting.

During the public meeting, questions were answered by Northland (e.g., typically Project specific questions) or by Hatch (e.g., typically REA process or environmental impact questions).

Feedback obtained from the first public meeting was used to provide direction for the scope of the assessment and ensure that local issues would be addressed as appropriate. Comment sheets were offered at the public meeting to all attendees as means to obtain and record comments and concerns as well as pertinent background information about the Project location.

Five (5) comment sheets were received during or following the first public meeting (see Section 2.4 for comments and responses). A copy of the comment sheets are found in Appendix E.

2.3.2 Final Public Meeting and Notice

The Notice of Final Public Meeting was published 60 days prior to the event in *The Smiths Falls EMC* on Thursday, January 6, 2011 and again on Thursday, February 10, 2011. The *Smiths Falls EMC* is a local paper with weekly publication, circulating from the Town of Smiths Falls and into the Township of Rideau Lakes. The paper in which the publication was posted was changed as a result of feedback from a representative of the Township as *The Smiths Falls EMC* was identified as having a larger circulation which would ensure more individuals were made aware of the meeting.

An updated mailing list, including any newly identified names and contact details was used for the mail out (see Appendix A). A total of forty four (44) stakeholders were issued covering letters and the Notice of Public Meeting on January 4, 2011. A copy of this Notice as it appeared in *The Smiths Falls EMC* and a copy of the letter that accompanied the Notice are provided in Appendix B.

The purpose of the final public meeting was to solicit feedback on the content and the findings of the reports prepared for the Project. Draft copies of the Project documents required to be prepared under the REA process were made available for public review on Thursday, January 6, 2011, at the Township of Rideau Lakes municipal office. Copies were posted on the Project website. These Project documents included the following:

- Executive Summary (including summaries of the following documents and Letters of Confirmation)
- Project Description Report
- Construction Plan Report
- Design and Operations Report
- Decommissioning Plan Report
- Noise Study Report
- Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Report
- Water Body Assessment Reports
- Natural Heritage Assessment Reports.

A minor error was noted in the Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Report, therefore a revised Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Report and corresponding updated Executive Summary was made available for public review and posted on the website on January 7, 2011.

The final public meeting was held on Thursday, March 10, 2011 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Portland Community Hall (24 Water Street, Portland, Township of Rideau Lakes), with a purpose to achieve the following:

- provide the community with detailed information about the Project
- solicit feedback on the content and the findings of the REA reports
- answer any questions about the Project
- obtain any comments or concerns with respect to the Project.

A total of 22 people signed in at the final public meeting.

The final public meeting followed an open house format with project details presented on display boards and printed copies available to visitors. This approach allowed for one-on-one discussions between representatives of Northland, Hatch and the public. Notes on comments from the Public were taken by the representatives of Northland and Hatch present at the meeting. Display boards provided general information on Northland and the Project, with an overview of the information found in the Project documents. A copy of the Project documents were available for review and discussion at the final public meeting. Copies of the display boards can be found in Appendix D.

Questions at the final public meeting were answered by both Northland and Hatch. Comment sheets were available at the second meeting to be filled in by the participants if they chose to do so. Northland and Hatch staff encouraged attendees to fill out comment sheets. A total of three (3) comment sheets were completed as a result of the final public meeting. Appendix E contains copies of the comment sheets.

Table 2.1 provides information on how these comments were addressed and incorporated into the finalization for these reports, as appropriate.

2.3.3 Other Public Consultation

The public was encouraged to communicate with the representatives from Northland and Hatch outside of the public meetings via any of the following forms of communication:

- email correspondence
- phone calls
- mail
- fax.

Full details on all correspondence received from the Public are provided in Appendix E. Several emails have been received from the public and their comments, concerns or questions are discussed in Table 2.1.

Prior to the final public meeting, interim meetings (hereafter referred to as the “Interim Meeting”) were organized with concerned landowners who live in proximity of the Project location and were held on February 9, 2011. The purpose of these meetings was to address any concerns prior to the final public meeting, to provide visual renderings of the proposed Project for discussion, and to identify any suggested changes to the Project. A representative from Northland and Hatch, were available at the meetings. Where appropriate, these changes were incorporated into the reports prior to the final public meeting (see Table 2.1).

2.4 Public Comments and Concerns

The comments and/or concerns that were obtained from the public (e.g., comment sheets, emails, verbal discussions, etc) during the Project consultation process along with the response and/or resulting actions taken to address each concern are provided in Table 2.1. Where applicable, the response also provides reference to where more detail can be found in the Project documents prepared under the REA Process. Additionally, any changes to the Project documents and/or to the Project made in response to public comments/concerns are identified in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Comments/Concerns from Public and Responses

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment or Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Comments/Questions Received via Email Prior to First Public Meeting		
Support of Renewable Energy	On August 15, 2010 an email was sent to Hatch stating “At the outset I would like to state that I welcome the development of the three solar projects. They represent a contribution to the Province’s move to alternative sources of energy and provide direct economic benefits for the Township of Rideau Lakes.”	Clarification: Northland Power has 3 projects proceeding through the REA process in Rideau Lakes Township. The Crosby solar Project is one of them. No response required.
Impact on Farmland	On August 15, 2010 an email was sent to Hatch stating “In principle I feel that it is important that these projects be designed in such a way that they have minimal impact on useable agricultural land. This includes not only the area actually occupied by the project but also adjacent areas which hopefully could be used for agricultural purposes either now or in future, if so desired. Although, it would appear that the projects occupy fairly marginal farmland, I would request that the existing projects and any future expansion respect this concern.”	A response sent August 16, 2010 indicated “In respect of your concern regarding agricultural land, the Projects will be designed to minimize the potential footprint to the greatest extent possible. Further, as part of the Renewable Energy Approval process, potential impacts to the surrounding environment must be considered, and it is anticipated that through the use of mitigation measures there will be no impact to agricultural lands beyond the Project boundaries.”

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment or Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Visual Impact	<p>On August 15, 2010 an email was sent to Hatch stating "Secondly I feel that the solar projects should be visually screened from the road. The solar "farms" I have seen to date have been very unattractive -- a jarring contrast when encountered on a drive through the countryside; in short, visually, they have a considerable negative environmental impact. This negative impact could be mitigated by screening the projects from the road by sensitive planting or some other means. Obviously the screening would have to be done in such a way that it would not impair the effectiveness of the solar panels and also in such a way that the screening itself did not represent a visual intrusion."</p>	<p>On August 16, 2010 a response was sent stating "In respect of potential visual impacts associated with the Projects, Northland Power has noted your concern in this regard. Northland Power is considering visual screening for each Project on a case-by-case basis. A determination as to whether visual screening will be implemented, and what forms such visual screening may take if implemented, has not been made at this time."</p> <p>At the time of this comment, Northland was in the early stages of the Project's design and had not yet produced a visual rendering of the project to solicit public input. Following the First Public Meeting and the Interim Meeting with various neighbours of the Project, Northland received similar comments from neighbours of the Project about visual impacts. As a result, Northland re-designed the Project layout in an effort to address their concerns. Visual renderings of the revised layout were presented at the Second Public Meeting and the feedback received from the public was positive.</p> <p>A communications plan has been developed for the Project. Should concerns be raised during the Project construction or operations phases, Northland will meet with the concerned individual(s) to discuss their concerns and determine if additional mitigation is warranted.</p>
Comments/Questions Received via Comment Sheets at First Public Meeting – August 24, 2010		
Health Impacts	<p>Concern about the health impacts. Requested a Risk Assessment by a non-participant.</p>	<p>Electrical equipment used in association with the solar project are present throughout Ontario in association with electrical infrastructure. No health effects of these types of equipment have been noted within the scientific literature. It is not anticipated that the Project will impact human health. Therefore, a risk assessment is not necessary.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment or Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Impacts to Water	Concerns relating to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tile drains • swampland • drainage basin/watershed of UNESCO site • concerned about chemical weed control runoff • reduced infiltration of rainwater. 	Impacts to wetland communities and water bodies are assessed and mitigated within the Construction Plan Report, the Waterbodies Environmental Impact Study and the Natural Heritage Environmental Impact Study. The result of these assessments was that no impact to water features is anticipated. Hazardous chemicals will not be used for vegetation control. Since these arrays are not contiguous (i.e. there are spaces between the arrays), since there are access roads between the rows of panels and since rainwater will flow off the panels, a reduction in the infiltration of rainwater is not anticipated.
Water Quality	Recommends studies regarding the well water quality and impacts from this Project be completed.	Through consultation with the Kingston District Office of the Ministry of the Environment, Northland has identified a proposed Baseline Water Well Monitoring Program and Construction Response Plan. Copies of this document were made available at the final public meeting, and are enclosed within this application.
Traffic	Concern about road traffic.	Mitigation measures are identified within Section 4.8 of the Construction Plan Report to ensure that impacts to traffic are minimized. These include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • designated transportation routes • appropriate signage • use of flagpersons, as required.
Educational Opportunity	Recommends trying to implement an educational opportunity.	Northland is currently considering long-term community involvement options, including educational opportunities.
Wildlife Impacts	Would like an environmental survey to determine what species will be displaced (including mammals, reptiles, plants and beneficial insects). Concerned about environmental impacts to wildlife species, such as birds, including nesting waterfowl.	Environmental surveys to determine the species on site and within 120 m have been completed and are identified within the Natural Heritage Site Investigation Report. Potential impacts to wildlife and plants are assessed, and mitigation measures identified, within the Natural Heritage Environmental Impact Study and the Construction Plan Report. Please see these reports for comprehensive information on the surveys, results and environmental impacts.

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment or Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Government	Why would this Project receive a go ahead before existing approved sites are operating (i.e. farmers in local area who have invested money)?	This question relates to government policies and therefore cannot be answered by Northland. . The Project will not proceed until all government requirements are met.
Noise	How much noise will there be? Would like to be assured that the noise from the distribution lines are not objectionable to residential occupancy.	A noise study has been completed for the Project to ensure that emissions during operations meet provincial limits.

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment or Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Visual Impacts	<p>Would like a buffer (such as hedges or trees).</p> <p>Requested field nearest Little Rideau Lakes Road not be used for solar panels.</p>	<p>At the time of this comment, Northland was in the early stages of the Project's design and had not yet produced a visual rendering of the project to solicit public input. Following the first public meeting, this concern was discussed during the Interim Meeting on February 9, 2011. At that meeting, Northland provided a visual rendering of the Project for discussion, which included the Project being set back from Little Rideau Lakes Road as previously requested. Based on feedback from the meeting, Northland re-designed their proposed layout for the Project to ensure a minimum 30-m setback from the farm road.</p> <p>The updated design and associated visual rendering were then presented on the display boards at the final public meeting for the Project on March 10, 2011. Based on discussions at the final public meeting, these individuals appreciated Northland's efforts to address their concerns, and appeared satisfied with the updated rendering.</p> <p>At this time, Northland does not believe additional visual mitigation measures will be necessary once vegetation within the setback areas have become established.</p> <p>A communications plan has been developed for the Project. Should concerns be raised during the Project construction or operations phases, Northland will meet with the concerned individual(s) to discuss their concerns and determine if additional mitigation is warranted.</p>
Use of Pesticides	<p>Concerned about runoff of herbicides</p> <p>Concerned that herbicides will be needed/used.</p>	<p>No hazardous chemicals, which includes herbicides, will be used for vegetation control. Low lying vegetation will be chosen for underneath the panels, therefore herbicides for vegetation control will not be needed.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment or Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Property Value	What happens to our property value?	While the Project's potential impact on property values are not known, the Project does mitigate visual impacts (discussed above) and ensures that the Project meets all sound level guidelines.
Comments/Questions Received via Email Prior to Final Public Meeting		
Groundwater	On January 14, 2011 an email was sent to Hatch from the Upper Rideau Lakes Association asking: "One of the outstanding concerns raised by many residents is the possible contamination of groundwater (as happened in South Elmsley) due to drilling holes in the limestone to set the support structures."	<p>This concern was first discussed during a phone conversation on January 13, 2011 between a representative of Northland and the concerned individual.</p> <p>Through consultation with the Kingston District Office of the Ministry of the Environment, as well as concerned landowners, Northland has identified a proposed Baseline Water Well Monitoring Program and Construction Response Plan.</p> <p>In response to this and other comments from the Upper Rideau Lakes Association, as well as those from the Cottage Road Association of 422 Little Rideau Lake Road, Northland organized the Interim Meeting. Northland addressed this issue at the Interim Meeting for residents to discuss their concerns.</p> <p>The basis of the Water Well Monitoring Program was presented and discussed at this Interim Meeting. Copies of this document were then made available at the Final Public Meeting, and are also enclosed within this application.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment or Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Animal Movement Corridor	<p>On January 14, 2011 an email was sent to Hatch from the Upper Rideau Lakes Association asking "We are also concerned with impact on Watercourse B which has been identified as an animal movement corridor for reptiles and amphibians of significance as it links critical breeding and over-wintering habitats – and drains directly into Steadman's Bay in Upper Rideau Lake. We have been advised that all structures, including fencing are at least 30 m back from the creek corridor, and that measures will be taken during construction to control erosion and sedimentation. My reading of the Executive Summary a minimum 60-m setback from aquatic habitat and biota (i.e., bullfrog breeding grounds) is recommended, and I would request clarification on this point."</p>	<p>This concern was discussed during a meeting with a representative of the Upper Rideau Lakes Association at the Interim Meeting on February 9, 2011, and during the final public meeting.</p> <p>A 30m setback from Watercourse B has been incorporated into the Project design. During construction, when disturbance effects associated with the Project are highest, a 60m setback from Watercourse B for active construction works will be in force during sensitive time periods. The use of these setbacks will ensure that there is no impact on animal movement and bullfrog breeding within Watercourse B and the associated wetland community.</p> <p>These mitigation measures have been detailed within the Natural Heritage Environmental Impact Study, which has been confirmed by the Ministry of Natural Resources as being prepared in accordance with their established procedures.</p>
Herbicide Use	<p>On January 14, 2011 an email was sent to Hatch from the Upper Rideau Lakes Association asking "We would like to reiterate our concerns about the possible future use of any herbicide or poisons to control weeds and foliage that might someday threaten to shade your panels – as these chemicals will find their way into Upper Rideau Lake after a rainfall through the existing tile drainage system. We would like to see assurance that under no circumstances will chemical weed control be considered."</p>	<p>This concern was discussed during a meeting with a representative of the Upper Rideau Lakes Association at the Interim Meeting on February 9, 2011, and during the Final Public Meeting.</p> <p>As is noted within the Design and Operations Report, no hazardous chemicals will be used for vegetation control. Low-lying vegetation will be chosen for underneath the panels, therefore, herbicides for vegetation control will not be needed.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment or Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Spills	<p>On January 14, 2011 an email was sent to Hatch from the Upper Rideau Lakes Association asking "What substance(s) could potentially leak from transformers or other equipment? What is the likelihood of such an occurrence?"</p>	<p>This concern was discussed during the Interim Meeting with a representative of the Upper Rideau Lakes Association on February 9, 2011, and during the Final Public Meeting.</p> <p>The transformers will contain oil, though the oil will not have PCBs.</p> <p>Potential accidental spills from the transformers have been considered within the Waterbodies Environmental Impact Study and the Natural Heritage Environmental Impact Study. The use of best management practices, including installation of a leak containment basin at the main transformer station will ensure that the potential for accidental spills into the natural environment are minimized.</p> <p>The likelihood of accidental spills from the transformers is low as they will be maintained by Northland in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment or Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Visual	<p>On January 14, 2011 an email was sent to Hatch from the Upper Rideau Lakes Association asking "Our final issue concerns the appearance of the site from adjacent properties and roadways. Chain-link fencing topped with barbed wire is unsightly and any measure taken to screen the fencing or set it back from the roadways so that future plantings of coniferous trees do not compromise the purpose of the fencing would be appreciated. I think making the site look attractive to the passing public will help local residents and all Ontarians more readily accept this new energy source."</p>	<p>At the time of this comment, Northland was in the early stages of the Project's design and had not yet produced a visual rendering of the project to solicit public input. Following the First Public Meeting, this concern was discussed during the Interim Meeting on February 9, 2011. At that meeting, Northland provided a visual rendering of the Project for discussion. Based on feedback from the meeting, Northland re-designed their proposed layout for the Project to ensure a minimum 30-m setback from the farm road.</p> <p>The updated design and associated visual rendering were then presented on the display boards at the Final Public Meeting for the Project on March 10, 2011. Based on discussions at the Final Public Meeting, these individuals appreciated Northland's efforts to address their concerns, and appeared satisfied with the updated rendering.</p> <p>At this time, Northland does not believe additional visual mitigation measures will be required once vegetation within the setback areas have become established.</p> <p>A communications plan has been developed for the Project. Should concerns be raised during the Project construction or operations phases, Northland will meet with the concerned individual(s) to discuss their concerns and determine if additional mitigation is warranted.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment or Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Groundwater	<p>On January 16, 2011 an email was received by Hatch stating "Ground Water Disturbance: After reading about the problems that the residents of South Elmsley, who live near the solar project there have had, I am very concerned. My understanding is that Northern Power Inc. (NPI) will make hundreds if not thousands of drill holes into bedrock to stabilize the supporting structures for the 50,000 +/- solar panels to be installed at the Crosby site. I appreciate that it is not clear yet that the drilling actually caused the problems in South Elmsley but no one would be surprised if it was. I understand that HATCH Inc. was also the consulting firm involved in that project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What measures is NPI taking to prevent this same potential problem at the Crosby site? If NPI does disturb the ground water and it becomes transiently or permanently disturbed/changed what remedial measures does NPI propose? Is HATCH or NPI aware of any other solar projects in Canada or elsewhere in the world where ground water has been transiently or permanently disturbed/changed? Are there means, other than drilling support poles into bedrock, of supporting the solar panels, for example concrete slabs? 	<p>Clarification: Hatch Ltd. was not involved with the Projects in South Elmsley.</p> <p>This concern was discussed with this individual during the Interim Meeting on February 9, 2011. Northland informed these residents that they had been in contact with the Kingston District of the Ministry of the Environment and were attempting to understand the cause of the issue around this other Project. Northland will be conducting additional geotechnical investigations to understand site conditions and determine foundation requirements. Northland also informed the residents of potential support options, and that they were not aware of any other solar projects that have had problems with groundwater contamination.</p> <p>At the Interim Meeting, Northland described the proposed baseline well water monitoring program and construction response plan. Drafts of these plans were then provided at the Final Public Meeting for review, and are enclosed within the REA Application. The comments that were received in response to the plans were positive.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment or Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Noise	<p>On January 16, 2011 an email to Hatch asked "I would like to ask NPI to put a soundproofing barrier around the most northwesterly inverter/transformer station, and perhaps the northeasterly one as well, just like the sound barrier around the Substation close to Little Rideau Lake Road."</p>	<p>This concern was discussed with this individual during the Interim Meeting on February 9, 2011. Prior to this meeting, the Noise Assessment Study was available for public review which showed that the Project met provincial standards at the closest receptor, and levels along the farm road did not exceed 40 dBA. Despite the proposed Project design meeting regulatory requirements for noise levels at sensitive receptors, based on feedback from the meeting, Northland redesigned their proposed layout for the Project to ensure the electrical equipment was relocated further away from the farm road, reducing noise levels along the farm road to a greater extent.</p> <p>The updated design and associated noise assessment study were presented on the display boards at the Final Public Meeting for the Project on March 10, 2011. Based on discussions at the Final Public Meeting, these individuals appreciated Northland's efforts to address their concerns. No additional request for soundproofing was made.</p>
Visual Impact	<p>On January 16, 2011 an email to Hatch asked "My neighbours and I purchased properties in the area because we wanted the "country experience" and all it entails. We certainly don't want to see fields of solar panels whenever we drive to and from our properties or go for a walk on our cottage lane. The map (Noise Assessment Report. Rev. A, Page B15) of the project shows the array of solar panels right up against the northwest property line and right beside our farm road, 422 Little Rideau Lake Road.</p> <p>How far back from the property line is the 2-m fence surrounding the project and particularly along to northwest boundary?</p> <p>Is the fence to be constructed around the boundary of all of the leased land or just around the footprint of the actual array of solar panels?</p>	<p>This concern was discussed with the individual during the Interim Meeting on February 9, 2011. At the meeting, Northland provided a visual rendering of the Project location for discussion. Based on feedback from the meeting, Northland re-designed their proposed layout for the Project to ensure a minimum 30-m setback from the farm road to the fence, which will be constructed around the footprint of the Project and not the edge of the leased lands. Existing vegetation along the boundary of the property and within the setback from the roadways will be maintained throughout the life of the Project.</p> <p>The updated design and associated visual rendering were then presented on the display boards at the final public meeting for the Project on March 10, 2011. Based on discussions at the final public meeting,</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment or Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	<p>What plans do you have for improving the 'visual landscape', especially along our farm road?</p> <p>I would ask NPI to have a 100 ft (30 m) setback for the fence along the northwest boundary of the leased land.</p> <p>I would ask NPI to construct a visual barrier along the northwest boundary, especially where the array of solar panels is close to the farm road. This visual barrier could be a berm or a row of evergreens within the 100 ft setback. There is an existing tree line between the two properties but it is thin and scraggly and for 6 or 7 months of the year has no leaves and is not a visual barrier at all. Since this is a northwest boundary, trees along this boundary will not reduce sunlight to the solar panels.</p>	<p>these individuals appreciated Northland's efforts to address their concerns, and appeared satisfied with the updated rendering.</p> <p>The Project setback from the farm road (minimum of 30 m) has been provided to minimize visual impact from adjacent public and private roadways. At this time, Northland does not believe additional visual mitigation measures will be required once vegetation within the setback areas have become established.</p> <p>A communications plan has been developed for the Project. Should concerns be raised during the Project construction or operations phases, Northland will meet with the concerned individual(s) to discuss their concerns and determine if additional mitigation is warranted.</p>
Surface Water Quality	<p>On January 16, 2011 an email to Hatch asked "I understand that the Upper Rideau Lake Association has concerns about surface water runoff into the Upper Rideau Lake and these will be addressed by them but are also a concern of mine and I suspect a concern of my neighbours as well."</p>	<p>Impacts to surface water are assessed and mitigated within the Construction Plan Report and the Waterbodies Environmental Impact Study. The results of these assessments was that no impact to surface water quality is anticipated.</p> <p>This concern was discussed with the individual, and a representative of the Upper Rideau Lake Association, during the Interim Meeting on February 9, 2011.</p>

Category of Comment or Concern	Comment or Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Comments/Questions Received via Comment Sheets at Final Public Meeting – March 10, 2011		
Visual	Use of foliage to reduce the visual impact.	<p>Project setbacks have been provided to minimize visual impact from adjacent public and private roadways. It is anticipated that vegetation growth within the setback will provide some visual screening of the Project.</p> <p>At this time, Northland does not believe additional visual mitigation measures will be required once vegetation within the setback areas have become established.</p> <p>A communications plan has been developed for the Project. Should concerns be raised during the Project construction or operations phases, Northland will meet with the concerned individual(s) to discuss their concerns and determine if additional mitigation is warranted.</p>
Transformer Station	Please consider the potential effects of the use of heat and chemicals from the transformer station.	<p>The heat from the 10MVA transformer is not significant enough to cause alterations in the local microclimate and the transformer station should not have an impact on either human or environmental health.</p> <p>Potential accidental spills from the transformer station have been considered within the Waterbodies Environmental Impact Study and the Natural Heritage Environmental Impact Study. The use of best management practices, including installation of a leak containment basin at the main transformer station will ensure that the potential for accidental spills into the natural environment are minimized.</p>
Decommissioning	Provide assurance that remedial work at end of Project life will occur (contracts/accountability)	Northland will be responsible for decommissioning the site in accordance with the requirements of the contract with the landowner, the procedures noted in the Decommissioning Plan Report, as well as any Terms and Conditions of the REA Approval (if obtained).
Project is Excellent	No concerns, I like the Project and believe it will help bring small town Ontario in to 2011.	No response required.

3. Consultation with Agencies

3.1 Agencies

Consultation with relevant government agencies including provincial ministries, local municipalities and others was completed as per the REA Regulation and MOE's "Guidance for Preparing the Consultation Report". The following agencies were consulted:

- Ministry of the Environment
- Ministry of Natural Resources
- Ministry of Tourism and Culture
- Rideau Valley Conservation Authority
- United Counties of Leeds and Grenville
- Township of Rideau Lakes
- Parks Canada.

The following section provides the details of the consultation completed with each agency.

3.1.1 *Ontario Ministry of Environment*

- Draft Project Description Reports were sent to the MOE on April 5, 2010 in order to commence the REA process. This step kicks off the REA process by requesting from the MOE the list of Aboriginal communities with whom Northland will be required to consult.
- Representatives of Northland and Hatch met with staff from the MOE's Head Office in Toronto, Ontario on April 16, 2010 to discuss the requirements of the Renewable Energy Approvals Process. Northland met with the Director of the Approvals Program and the Supervisor of Renewable Energy Approvals. The purpose of the meeting was to gain greater clarity on the timing and requirements of several aspects of the REA process.
- The MOE provided comments on the Draft Project Description Report in early May 2010. The Project Description Report was revised to meet these comments, and provided to the MOE on May 11, 2010.
- On July 22, 2010, the Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project and Public Meeting was sent to the Ministry of the Environment. The Notice of Final Public Meeting was sent on January 4, 2011.
- On October 6, 2010, representatives of Northland and Hatch met with the MOE's Director of Approvals at the MOE's Head Office in Toronto, Ontario. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss, in greater detail, the requirements of the REA Application so that Northland would have clear understanding of the MOE's expectations.
- Representatives of Northland and Hatch met with staff from MOE Kingston District on January 13, 2011. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss groundwater concerns present around solar projects being constructed in the Township of Rideau Lakes. MOE provided background information on the concerns at the solar projects under construction and requested

that a baseline well water monitoring program be developed. Northland requested that MOE provide recommendations for the program. MOE also mentioned that they had received calls from neighbours of Northland's proposed Projects (exact Project not identified) with concerns around aesthetics and water quality).

- Following the meeting, a recommended program was provided to Northland and Hatch on February 7, 2011.
- Using the recommended program, a draft Baseline Well Water Monitoring Program and Construction Response Plan was developed, and provided to MOE Kingston District for review on March 22, 2011.
- A minor comment relating to the method of identified water wells for baseline testing was provided by MOE Kingston District to Hatch on March 23, 2011. Other than this minor comment, the MOE Kingston District indicated that they had no other issues or concerns with the Program.
- On March 24, 2011, Hatch indicated that they would revise the program to clarify that wells to be subject to baseline testing will be identified through both reviewing MOE well records and observations on site/discussions with local landowners.

Appendix F contains copies of correspondence between Hatch and the MOE.

3.1.2 Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources

- In May 2010, Hatch requested a meeting with MNR Kemptville to discuss the Projects. Based on workloads and staffing, MNR Kemptville declined to meet and requested that an Information Request be submitted on June 4, 2010.
- On June 12, 2010, an information request was electronically submitted to Kemptville MNR office.
- On July 6, 2010, Hatch again requested a meeting with MNR Kemptville to discuss the Projects following completion of the site investigations. MNR Kemptville again declined to meet, and stated that they would be willing to have a meeting following submission of the draft Natural Heritage Assessment reports.
- On July 12, 2010, Hatch received the completed information request for the Crosby Project from MNR Kemptville. The information request identified natural features and species at risk/species of conservation concern that should be considered during the site investigations.
- On August 11, 2010, copies of the Natural Heritage Records Review, Site Investigation Report, Evaluation of Significance, and Environmental Impact Study were provided to MNR Kemptville for review.
- On September 17, 2010, representatives of Northland and Hatch met with MNR Kemptville to review the Projects. Preliminary comments on the reports were made at that time.
- On September 29, 2010, updated reports were provided to MNR Kemptville which addressed comments made during the meeting on September 17, 2010.

- On October 21, 2010, comments were provided to Hatch by MNR Kemptville, with a meeting to discuss the comments held on October 26, 2010 with representatives of Northland, Hatch, and MNR Kemptville.
- On November 2, 2010, at the request of MNR Kemptville, Hatch provided electronic copies of the text of the Natural Heritage Assessment reports to MNR Kemptville.
- On November 8, 2010, representatives of Hatch, Natural Resources Solutions Inc., Northland, and MNR Kemptville met to discuss the wetland evaluation for the Project. Based on comments provided at the meeting, the wetland evaluation was revised slightly.
- On November 15, 2010, updated reports were provided to MNR Kemptville which addressed previous comments on the wetland evaluation and Natural Heritage reports.
- On November 25, 2010, MNR Kemptville provided additional comments on the Natural Heritage reports. Updated reports that addressed these comments were provided by Hatch to MNR Kemptville on December 1, 2010.
- On December 20, 2010, MNR Kemptville provided additional comments on the Natural Heritage reports. Updated reports that addressed these comments were provided by Hatch to MNR Kemptville on December 20, 2010.
- MNR Kemptville provided their confirmation letter of the Natural Heritage Reports on December 20, 2010.

Appendix F contains copies of correspondence between Hatch and the MNR.

3.1.3 Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture

- Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. (ARA) submitted an Archaeological Assessment Report entitled 'Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Crosby Solar Project' to the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC) on August 31, 2010. The Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report recommended that the locations with potential to be archaeological significant be subjected to a Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment.
- On September 9, 2010, the MTC responded that the archaeological assessment undertaken for the Project complies with the Ontario Heritage Act's licensing requirements, including the license terms and conditions and the Ministry's 1993 Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines. This letter is included in Appendix F.
- Following additional consultation with the MTC, including a meeting at the MTC's offices on October 12, 2010, the 'Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Crosby Solar Project' was revised such that the report recommended setbacks from the locations with potential to be archaeological significant to ensure no impact on the potentially significant features. Therefore, the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report concluded that the locations with potential to be archaeological significant lie well away from lands and could be properly protected such that there would no further assessment required. A final revision of this report was resubmitted by ARA to the MTC on January 6, 2011.
- On January 6, 2011, the MTC responded that the archaeological assessment undertaken for the Project complies with the Ontario Heritage Act's licensing requirements, including the license

terms and conditions and the Ministry's 1993 Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines. This letter is included in Appendix F.

3.1.4 Rideau Valley Conservation Authority

- Hatch submitted a Property Inquiry request to the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA) in June 2010 for information on natural heritage and water body features on or within 120 m of the Project location.
- A letter was sent to Hatch by the RVCA on June 29, 2010 in response to the Property Inquiry. The RVCA identified a Provincially Significant Wetland which occurs near the property, though not within 120 m of the Project location. The RVCA also identified requirements in respect of construction near watercourses. The RVCA recommended a 30-m setback from watercourses; a 30-m setback from the high water mark of watercourses has been incorporated within the design of the Project.

Appendix F contains copies of correspondence between Hatch and the RVCA.

3.1.5 United Counties of Leeds and Grenville

- On June 30, 2010, Hatch spoke with Sandy Hay, the county planner. Hatch described the Project location, and requested a meeting with Sandy Hay to discuss the Project further. The meeting request was declined. Hatch requested information relating to the County's interest in the Project. Sandy Hay indicated that their interests would solely consist of entrance permit requirements off of the County roads.
- On June 30, 2010 an email containing the municipal consultation form and Project Description Report was sent to the Clerk of the County of Leeds and Grenville, and copied to Sandy Hay.
- On July 22, 2010, the Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project and Public Meeting was sent to the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville. The Notice of Final Public Meeting was sent on January 4, 2011.
- On March 21, 2011, Hatch spoke with Les Sheppard (LS), Director of Works, Planning Services and Asset Management, to determine if there were any concerns identified with the Projects and to request the completed municipal consultation form. No concerns were identified, however LS asked that the form be sent again.
- Hatch e-mailed LS a copy of the municipal consultation form, as requested, on March 21, 2011
- The completed municipal consultation form was provided to Hatch on March 29, 2011. A copy of the form is included in Appendix G.

Appendix G contains any correspondence with the municipality.

3.1.6 Township of Rideau Lakes

- On January 21, 2010, representatives of Northland met with Sheldon Laidman (SL), Manager of Development Services. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce Northland to the local municipality and establish a working relationship. Topics discussed include the permitting process, local requirements, and interaction with the municipality during the development of the project.

- On June 15, 2010, representatives of Northland and Hatch met with SL. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the Township to the proposed Project and to further discuss requirements. The following items were discussed:
 - ◆ Hatch requested information on locations of suitable halls within the township, and newspapers with general circulation. SL indicated that the Crosby Hall would be suitable, and that the Westport Review Mirror is the appropriate publication.
 - ◆ SL indicated that there is a fee for completion of the Municipal Consultation Form.
 - ◆ Hatch requested clarification as to whether a building permit would be required. SL indicated that they would be required for inverter stations or larger buildings.
 - ◆ SL indicated that a road entrance permit would be required, the requirements for which has been recently amended by the Township. SL recommended that Northland follow-up with the Public Works Manager around entrance permits. SL indicated entrance permits typically take 2 to 3 days to obtain.
 - ◆ Hatch requested clarification as to whether there was a Tree Clearing By-law within the Township. SL indicated that there was no Tree Clearing By-law within either the Township or County.
 - ◆ Hatch requested information on natural heritage features and waterbodies. SL recommended contacting the MNR.
 - ◆ SL requested information on visual mitigation and fence design. Northland indicated that as the Project is still in a preliminary stage of design, no such information was available, however this information would be provided within the Design and Operations Report.
- On June 30, 2010 an email containing the municipal consultation form and Project Description Reports was sent to the Clerk of the Township of Rideau Lakes.
- On July 5, 2010, SL responded to the submission advising Northland and Hatch of the fee for review of the municipal consultation form.
- On July 22, 2010, the Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project and Public Meeting was sent to the Township of Rideau Lakes. The Notice of Final Public Meeting was sent on January 4, 2011.
- On January 10, 2011, Hatch requested information on the municipal consultation form review fee, which was provided by SL in an e-mail on the same day.
- On February 28, 2011, Hatch spoke with SL to determine if there were any concerns identified with the Project and to request the completed municipal consultation form. SL asked that the form be sent again.
- As requested by the Township of Rideau Lakes, an electronic copy of the municipal consultation form was e-mailed to SL on February 28, 2011.

- The completed Municipal Consultation Form was provided to Hatch by the Township on March 15, 2011. On March 16, 2011, an updated Municipal Consultation Form was provided to Hatch by the Township after an error in the completed form was noted. A copy of the form is included in Appendix G.

Appendix G contains any correspondence with the municipality.

3.1.7 Parks Canada

- In order to complete the heritage checklist as per the REA Regulation, correspondence with Parks Canada took place. Parks Canada requested that additional information be provided with respect to the viewscape from the Rideau River to the Project location. Hatch provided the additional information, including photographs taken from the Rideau River aimed at the Project location, which adequately addressed Parks Canada concerns and they determined a heritage assessment was not required.

Appendix F contains the correspondence and information exchange between Parks Canada and Hatch.

3.2 Agency Comments and Concerns

Agency comments and concerns are included in Table 3.1, which also indicates how the Project and/or document were modified to meet the agency comments/concerns.

Table 3.1 Comments/Concern From Agencies and Responses

Agency	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Ontario Ministry of the Environment	Request for baseline well water testing.	Northland has developed a "Baseline Well Water Monitoring Program and Construction Response Plan".
Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources	Various comments were provided regarding the Natural Heritage reports.	All comments were addressed by revising the Natural Heritage Reports.
Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture	In consultation with the MTC, it was recommended that the project proceed without further heritage concerns, as locations with potential to be archaeological significant lie well away from lands and can be properly protected.	None required.
Rideau Valley Conservation Authority	RVCA provided information on natural features on and near the Project location. Request for 30-m setback from high water mark of waterbodies.	This information was incorporated into the Natural Heritage Assessment for the Project 30-m setback from high water mark of watercourses is included within the design of the Project (see Waterbodies Environmental Impact Study).
United Counties of Leeds and Grenville	It was noted through a conversation that UCLG's concerns relate to the entrance permits off of County roads.	As the Project is not located on a County Road, there is no entrance permit required.
	No concerns with respect to Project road access.	None required.
Township of Rideau Lakes	Concerns relating to the difficulty for roads nearby the project to withstand a large construction.	Northland acknowledges that road maintenance will be required during the construction period to maintain local roadways in a serviceable manner consistent with current conditions. Northland is continuing to work with the Township to ensure that concerns regarding roadways are addressed.
	The Township expressed their interest to see a detailed road access drawing to ensure that it is designed properly.	Northland will provide the Township with a detailed road access drawing, as requested, as part of their application for an Entrance Permit.
	The Township made a comment on not allowing construction traffic on McCann Road.	Northland will work with the Township to ensure that transportation routes are identified in consideration of Township interests/requirements.

Agency	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	The Township expressed their concern to see and review a detailed landscaping plan.	Northland will continue to consult with the Township on the visual aspects of the Project. A landscaping plan will be provided if, after additional consultation, it is still desired.
	The Township expects that all internal roads will be designed to allow emergency-vehicle access.	Northland will consult with the Fire Chief to ensure internal roadways are designed to permit emergency-vehicle access.
	The Township expressed its expectation that the main 44-kV line be buried to lessen visual impacts and substations and parking lot be buffered from view by landscaping.	Northland will consider the Township's request that their connection from the transformer station to the distribution network along Little Rideau Lakes Rd. be buried. The final determination as to whether this is possible will depend partially on site conditions (e.g., potential for shallow bedrock preventing burying of the line, etc.) and will follow additional consultation with the municipality.
	The Township commented on the streams having a 30-m setback where no development is permitted.	All watercourses identified during the Water Body Site Investigation Report have been provided with a 30-m setback from panels, transformers and inverters.
	The Township commented that all temporary parking areas established for construction be returned to their original condition.	As is described within the Construction Plan Report, temporary parking and laydown areas required during construction will be restored following the completion of construction.
	The Township requested baseline water testing of wells within 300 m of the property.	As is described within Section 3.1.1, Northland has consulted with the MOE to establish a baseline well water monitoring program that will establish baseline conditions for wells within 500 m of the Project location.
	The Township has requested that panels be relocated away from the northern lot line.	Based on public feedback prior to the Township submitting their Municipal Consultation Form, Northland redesigned their layout such that there is now a minimum 30-m setback from the northern lot line for panels. This is 20 m farther than was originally proposed.
	The Township requested visual mitigation for the Project	Northland has designed the Project such that all Project components, with the exception of the access road and line connection, are at least approximately 100 m away from Little Rideau Lakes

Agency	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
		<p>Rd., and at least 30 m away from the private drive along the northern boundary of the site. At this time, additional visual mitigation is not anticipated to be required, as feedback from local residents received at the Final Public Meeting was positive. Existing vegetation along the boundary of the property and within the setback from the roadways will be maintained throughout the life of the Project.</p>
	<p>The Township requested that drilling and construction be conducted in accordance with the noise by-law and that the number of drills in operation at any one time will be limited to a maximum of two.</p>	<p>Northland will ensure that all construction activities are conducted in accordance with the local noise by-law. Further, Northland will work with the construction manager to ensure that all efforts are made to minimize the amount of noise disturbance emanating from the Project location during construction.</p>
	<p>The Township requested that no chemical weed control be used.</p>	<p>Hazardous chemicals will not be used for vegetation control.</p>
<p>Parks Canada</p>	<p>Concern that Project would affect viewscape from the Rideau River (Heritage River).</p>	<p>Hatch photographed views from the Rideau River to the Project location and provided report to Parks Canada. Since it was determined that the Project would not impact the view from the Rideau River, Parks Canada responded that no further work or changes were required.</p>

4. Consultation with Aboriginal Communities

It is the Crown's fiduciary obligation to conduct meaningful consultation in good faith with First Nation and Aboriginal communities. The Crown has delegated some of the consultation to the Proponent of renewable energy projects as per the REA Regulation. Pursuant to O. Reg. 359/09, Proponents are required to engage meaningfully with Aboriginal groups regarding traditional ecological knowledge, traditional land use, land claims and other interests and issues with respect to the development of the Project.

It is noted that at the time of submittal of this report, MOE stated that an Aboriginal consultation document, titled "*Aboriginal Consultation Guide for Renewable Energy Projects Governed Under O.Reg.359/09: Aboriginal Consultation Guide*" was being drafted to be released at a later date, but is not currently publicly available. As a result, the "*Technical Bulletin Five - Guidance for Preparing the Consultation Report*" (MOE, 2010) was used as a reference for meeting Aboriginal consultation requirements.

The following provides information related to the Aboriginal consultation completed for the Project.

4.1 Aboriginal Community Consultation List

On April 5, 2010, Northland Power provided the MOE with the Draft Project Description Report. As per the REA Regulation, the submission of the Project Description Report is required in order for the MOE to provide a list of the Aboriginal communities that Northland is to consult with.

The MOE provided comments on the Draft Project Description Report in early May 2010. The Project Description Report was revised to meet these comments, and provided to the MOE on May 11, 2010.

On July 9, 2010 MOE provided the list of Aboriginal communities, which is included in Appendix H.

4.2 Consultation Activities

4.2.1 *First Public Meeting and Notice*

The combined Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Project and Notice of a Public Meeting was sent to the Aboriginal communities on the MOE list on July 20, 2010.

With the Notice, a letter was included which, as per the REA Regulation, requested written information regarding any potential impact on treaty or constitutional protected lands and possible mitigating measures. Appendix I contains copies of the letters.

No individuals who attended the first public meeting identified themselves as members of any Aboriginal community. Section 2.3.1 above provides information on the first public meeting.

The Notice and Draft Project Description Report were posted on the Project website (northlandpower.ca/crosby) at the same time the Notice was published. The PDR was also made available for public review at the Township of Rideau Lakes municipal office 30 days prior to the first public meeting.

4.2.2 *Final Public Meeting and Notice*

On January 4, 2011, after all Project documents were drafted and letters of confirmation were received from MNR and MTC, the Aboriginal communities on the MOE's list were sent summaries of

all reports and copies of all Project Reports, as per the requirements of REA Regulation. A minor error was noted in the Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Report, therefore a revised Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Report and corresponding updated Executive Summary was sent out again to all the Aboriginal communities on the MOE's list on January 7, 2011.

Additionally, all Aboriginal communities were sent the Notice of Final Public Meeting and an accompanying letter on January 5, 2011. Appendix I contains copies of the Notice and the letters.

Section 2.3.2 provides the details of the Final public meeting. No attendees at the final public meeting identified themselves as members of any Aboriginal community.

4.3 Other Aboriginal Consultation Activities

After each Aboriginal community received the summaries of the Project documents and the Project documents, Hatch contacted each Aboriginal community. They were contacted to ensure that they received the reports and to determine if they had any comments or concerns.

The details of the communications and activities for each Aboriginal community are contained in Table 4.1. Appendix J contains any correspondence with the Aboriginal communities.

Table 4.1 Details of Additional Consultation Activities

Community/Group	Details of Additional Consultation Activities
Algonquins of Ontario Consultation Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hatch contacted the Consultation Office on January 19, 2011 and confirmed the reports had been received • Consultation office indicated reports were under review • Hatch confirmed that reports were still under review on February 16, 2011 by contacting the Consultation Office • Hatch spoke with Janet Restoule of the Consultation office on March 25, 2011. Janet confirmed that the reports were still under review, but no concerns had been identified to date. Further, she indicated that since the Project is on private land, the Algonquins of Ontario are less concerned than if the Project were on Crown land.
Alderville First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northland contacted Dave Simpson, a representative of the Alderville First Nation, on January 12, 2011. Dave Simpson confirmed that the reports had been received and that the Projects were of low interest to the Alderville First Nation. • On April 4, 2011, Hatch spoke with Dave Simpson inquiring as to whether a formal response could be received. He indicated that he thought one had been provided indicating that they would be of low interest, but that he would confirm and ensure one was sent out.
Hiawatha First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hatch contacted Diane Sheridan, Land Resource Worker, of the Hiawatha First Nation on January 24, 2011. Diana Sheridan confirmed that the reports had been received and indicated that she would provide comment. • On January 26, 2011, Diane Sheridan provided an email to Hatch indicating that the Hiawatha First Nation have no concerns at this time.

Community/Group	Details of Additional Consultation Activities
Curve Lake First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northland/Hatch contacted the Curve Lake First Nation on November 29, 2010 and January 19, 2011. • On January 24, 2011, Tammy of the Curve Lake First Nation contacted Hatch, and she indicated that she would determine whether the reports had been received. • On February 3, 2011, Hatch contacted the Curve Lake First Nation, no response was provided. • On February 16, 2011, Hatch spoke again with Tammy of the Curve Lake First Nation. Tammy indicated that the information had been forwarded to the "Duty to Consult" group. • On March 29th, 2011, Hatch spoke with Tammy of the Curve Lake First Nation. Tammy indicated that Hatch should contact the Land Resource Consultation Workers • On March 30th, 2011, Hatch spoke with one of the Land Resource Consultation Workers. She indicated that a response would be coming shortly. • On March 31st, 2011, Hatch received a response from the Curve Lake First Nation. The response indicated that they were not aware of any issues that would cause concern with respect to the Traditional, Aboriginal or Treaty rights. The response also recommended contacting Karry Sandy-Mackenzie, Williams Treaty First Nation Claims Coordinator. • Northland has previously attempted to contact Karry Sandy-Mackenzie on January 11th and January 18th, 2011 in relation to the Project. No response has been received to date.
Kawartha Nishnawbe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northland/Hatch have made repeated efforts (2010: Nov. 29, Dec.13; 2011: Feb.3, Feb. 16, Mar. 4, Mar. 25) to contact the Kawartha Nishnawbe, with voice messages left for Chief Nahrgang.
Métis Nation of Ontario	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See consultation activities with James Wagar, Consultation Assessment Coordinator for the Métis Nation of Ontario below.

Community/Group	Details of Additional Consultation Activities
Ottawa Regional Métis Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northland contacted President Pellerin. President Pellerin advised contacting James Wagar, Consultation Assessment Coordinator for the Métis Nation of Ontario. He indicated that James Wagar will notify the Ottawa Regional Métis Council of any issues. • Northland/Hatch contacted James Wagar on January 11, 2011. He provided a list of questions around the Métis broad area of interests. • Hatch provided a response to James Wagar’s questions in a memorandum sent via email on February 3, 2011. • Hatch contacted James Wagar on February 16, 2011 to confirm that memorandum had been received. James Wagar indicated that the communities were currently reviewing the information. He also indicated that a meeting would likely be requested. • Hatch emailed James Wagar on February 28, 2011, advising him of the upcoming public meeting for the Project. James Wagar replied requesting additional information on where the Project was located and what phase of development the Project was currently at. Hatch provided this information in a response on the same day. • James Wagar emailed Hatch on March 29, 2011, requesting a meeting with the Ottawa Regional Métis Council to learn more about the Project. • Consultation activities are ongoing.

4.4 Aboriginal Comments and Concerns

Northland Power supports the use of traditional Aboriginal knowledge and through this consultation process aims to provide a method to incorporate this knowledge and to address any comments or concerns about the Project from the Aboriginal perspective. Comments and concerns are contained below for each community or organization, along with any responses that were required to effectively address the concern and/or incorporate this knowledge into the Project design.

The comments and concerns received, along with the responses, are provided in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Comments/Concerns from Aboriginal Communities and Responses

Aboriginal Community/Group	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Algonquins of Ontario Consultation Office	None to date.	Ongoing efforts will be made by Northland to determine if Algonquins of Ontario have any comments or concerns with respect to the proposed Project.
Alderville First Nation	Conversation on January 12, 2011, requested to be kept up-to-date on ongoing activities.	Northland will continue to inform the Aboriginal community of ongoing Project developments.
Hiawatha First Nation	Letter dated, January 25, 2011, requested to be kept up-to-date on ongoing activities.	Northland will continue to inform the Aboriginal community of ongoing Project developments.
Curve Lake First Nation	Letter dated, March 31, 2011, requested to be kept up-to-date on ongoing activities.	Northland will continue to inform the Aboriginal community of ongoing Project developments. Northland will continue efforts to contact Karry Sandy-McKenzie.
	Concerns around potential for uncovering remains of ancestors.	The Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessments were completed and concluded that the potential for archaeological resources on site was low and further investigations are not required. Northland acknowledges the importance of Aboriginal remains. Should remains be uncovered during construction work will stop. Should they be of Aboriginal origin, the Aboriginal communities identified within this Table will be consulted prior to further action being taken in relation to the identified remains.
Kawartha Nishnawbe	None to date.	Northland will continue to inform Aboriginal community of ongoing Project developments.
Métis Nation of Ontario	None to date.	Ongoing efforts will be made by Northland to determine if the Métis Nation of Ontario have any comments or concerns with respect to the proposed Project.
Ottawa Regional Métis Council	None to date.	Ongoing efforts will be made by Northland to determine if the Ottawa Regional Métis Council have any comments or concerns with respect to the proposed Project.

5. Conclusions

Since May 2010, the consultation program for the Crosby Solar Project has been active. There has been open dialogue with the public, agencies, Aboriginal groups and the local municipalities regarding the Project. In addition to communications via email, letters, meetings and phone calls, there was an initial first public meeting followed by a more detailed Interim Meeting with local residents, hosted by Northland. This purpose of the Interim Meeting was to further encourage discussion and comment on the Project specifics. The Interim Meeting was followed by the final public meeting. The purpose of this Consultation Report is to ensure a transparent and meaningful consultation process for all participants with an interest in the Project, where all comments and questions received are documented, reviewed and addressed.

As a result of these opportunities for comment, several issues were raised that have been considered as part of the Project assessment, and provided additional guidance toward the scope of the studies. These issues were considered and incorporated into the REA application documents and the Project design, as appropriate.

Blank back

6. References

Ministry of the Environment (MOE). 2010. Technical Bulletin Five – Guidance for Preparing the Consultation Report. March 1, 2010.