



**GRAND BEND WIND FARM  
CONSULTATION REPORT**

File No. 160960765  
February 2013

*Prepared for:*

**Grand Bend Wind Limited Partnership,  
with Northland Power Inc. as Agent**  
30 St. Clair Avenue West, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor, Toronto,  
ON M4V 3A1

*Prepared by:*

**Stantec Consulting Ltd.**  
70 Southgate Drive, Suite 1  
Guelph ON N1G 4P5

*In association with:*

**Neegan Burnside Ltd.**  
292 Speedvale Avenue West, Unit 20  
Guelph ON N1H 1C4

## Table of Contents

---

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1.1</b>
1.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW .....	1.1
1.2 REPORT REQUIREMENTS .....	1.1
<hr/>	
<b>2.0 CONSULTATION PROCESS .....</b>	<b>2.1</b>
<hr/>	
<b>3.0 OVERVIEW OF COMMUNICATION TOOLS.....</b>	<b>3.1</b>
3.1 COMMUNICATION TOOLS USED FOR CONSULTATION .....	3.1
3.2 STAKEHOLDER USE OF COMMUNICATION TOOLS.....	3.2
3.3 CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING .....	3.2
<hr/>	
<b>4.0 NOTICES OF PROJECT AND MEETINGS .....</b>	<b>4.1</b>
4.1 PRE-DISCLOSURE .....	4.1
4.2 PROJECT DISTRIBUTION LIST.....	4.1
4.2.1 Assessed Landowners .....	4.1
4.2.2 Participating Landowners .....	4.2
4.2.3 Federal and Provincial Agencies .....	4.2
4.2.4 Municipalities and Elected Officials .....	4.2
4.2.5 Aboriginal Communities.....	4.3
4.2.6 Other Interested Stakeholders.....	4.3
4.2.7 Updates to the Project Distribution List.....	4.3
4.3 NOTICES.....	4.4
4.3.1 Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project.....	4.4
4.3.2 Notice of Draft Site Plan .....	4.5
4.3.3 Notice of Draft REA Reports Public Review and Notice of Final Public Meeting .....	4.5
4.3.4 Notice of Draft Site Plan Extension.....	4.6
4.4 SUMMARY OF NEWSPAPER PUBLICATION OF NOTICES .....	4.6
<hr/>	
<b>5.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION .....</b>	<b>5.1</b>
5.1 OVERVIEW.....	5.1
5.2 PUBLIC MEETINGS .....	5.1
5.2.1 General Description of Public Meetings.....	5.1
5.2.2 Public Meeting #1 – April 2012 .....	5.2
5.2.3 Final Public Meeting – November and December 2012.....	5.3
5.3 RELEASE OF DRAFT REA REPORTS .....	5.5
5.3.1 Summary of Public Review Locations for Draft REA Reports .....	5.6
5.4 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES.....	5.6
5.4.1 Project Community Newspaper Columns .....	5.6
5.5 CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS .....	5.11
5.5.1 Public .....	5.11
5.5.2 Interest Groups and Non-Governmental Organizations .....	5.17

## Table of Contents

---

5.6	CHANGES TO REA REPORTS.....	5.22
5.6.1	Post-Public Review – Presented at the Final Public Meeting.....	5.22
5.6.2	Post-Final Public Meeting.....	5.23
<hr/>		
<b>6.0</b>	<b>AGENCY AND MUNICIPAL CONSULTATION .....</b>	<b>6.1</b>
6.1	AGENCY PROJECT NOTIFICATION AND GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE .....	6.1
6.2	FEDERAL AGENCY AND ORGANIZATION CONSULTATION.....	6.2
6.2.1	Federal Agency Distribution List.....	6.2
6.2.2	Summary of Key Correspondence and Consideration of Key Comments .....	6.3
6.2.3	Consideration of Key Comments.....	6.3
6.3	PROVINCIAL AGENCY AND ORGANIZATION CONSULTATION .....	6.5
6.3.1	Provincial Agency and Authority Distribution List.....	6.5
6.3.2	Summary of Key Correspondence and Consideration of Key Comments .....	6.6
6.3.3	Consideration of Key Provincial Agency Comments.....	6.9
6.4	CONSULTATION REGARDING TELECOMMUNICATION AND RADAR SYSTEMS.....	6.13
6.4.1	Summary of Key Comments.....	6.13
6.5	MUNICIPAL STAFF AND ELECTED OFFICIALS CONSULTATION.....	6.15
6.5.1	Notices and Municipal Consultation Form Distribution.....	6.15
6.5.2	Overview of Consultation with Municipal Staff .....	6.16
6.6	CONSULTATION WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS .....	6.23
6.6.1	Overview of Consultation with Local Elected Officials.....	6.23
6.6.2	Overview of Consultation with Federal and Provincial Elected Officials.....	6.23
<hr/>		
<b>7.0</b>	<b>ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT .....</b>	<b>7.1</b>
7.1	IDENTIFICATION OF ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES WITH AN INTEREST IN THE PROJECT .....	7.1
7.1	COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES.....	7.2
7.1.1	Draft Project Description Report .....	7.2
7.1.2	Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project .....	7.3
7.1.3	Notice of Draft Site Plan .....	7.3
7.1.4	Notice of Draft REA Reports Public Review and Notice of Final Public Meeting .....	7.3
7.1.5	Notice of Draft Site Plan Extension.....	7.3
7.1.6	Local Newspaper Notices.....	7.3
7.1.7	Project Telephone, E-mail, Mail and Website .....	7.4
7.1.8	Draft REA Reports.....	7.4
7.2	OVERVIEW OF ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT .....	7.5
7.2.1	Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation.....	7.5
7.2.2	Chippewas of the Thames First Nation.....	7.5
7.2.3	Aamjiwnaang First Nation.....	7.7
7.2.4	Aamjiwnaang First Nation Community Open House .....	7.8
7.2.5	Walpole Island First Nation.....	7.10
7.2.6	Walpole Island First Nation Community Open House .....	7.11

**Table of Contents**


---

7.2.7	Oneida Nation of the Thames.....	7.14
7.2.8	Historic Saugeen Métis .....	7.14
7.2.9	Munsee-Delaware Nation.....	7.16
7.2.10	Delaware First Nation.....	7.16
7.2.11	Métis Nation of Ontario.....	7.16

---

<b>8.0</b>	<b>PLAN FOR ONGOING CONSULTATION .....</b>	<b>8.1</b>
8.1	FINAL REA REPORTS .....	8.1
8.2	COMMUNITY UPDATES .....	8.1
8.3	COMMUNICATIONS AND ISSUE RESPONSE PROTOCOL .....	8.2

---

<b>9.0</b>	<b>CLOSURE .....</b>	<b>9.1</b>
------------	----------------------	------------

**List of Tables**


---

Table 1.1:	Consultation Requirements (as per Ontario Regulation 359/09-Table 1).....	1.2
Table 4.1:	Summary of Newspaper Notices.....	4.7
Table 5.1:	Public Meeting #1: Key Information.....	5.2
Table 5.2:	Final Public Meeting: Key Information.....	5.4
Table 5.3:	Summary of Public Review Locations for Draft REA Reports.....	5.6
Table 5.4:	Summary of Community Newspaper Columns.....	5.8
Table 5.5:	Summary of Key and Frequent Comments from Public and Consideration by Project Team .....	5.12
Table 5.6:	Consideration of Key Comments from Interest Groups and Non-Governmental Organizations .....	5.18
Table 5.7:	Summary of REA Report Amendments.....	5.22
Table 5.8:	Summary of REA Report Amendments.....	5.23
Table 6.1:	Key Comments from Federal Agencies and Organizations, and Consideration by Project Team.....	6.4
Table 6.2:	Summary of NHA Submissions and MNR Responses .....	6.7
Table 6.3:	Key Comments from Provincial Agencies and Consideration by Project Team ..	6.10
Table 6.4:	Key Comments from Telecommunication and Radar Systems Providers.....	6.14
Table 6.5:	Key Comments from Municipalities and Consideration by Project Team.....	6.20

## **Table of Contents**

---

### **List of Appendices**

---

- Appendix A Project Map
- Appendix A1 Project Location and Study Area Map
- Appendix B Project Distribution Lists
- Appendix B1 Distribution Area for Assessed Landowners (Map)
- Appendix B2 Agency Distribution List
- Appendix B3 Municipal Staff and Elected Officials Distribution List
- Appendix B4 Aboriginal Community Distribution List
- Appendix B5 Interest Group and Non-Governmental Organization Distribution List
- Appendix C Project Notices
- Appendix C1 Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project
- Appendix C2 Notice of Draft Site Plan
- Appendix C3 Notice of Draft REA Reports Public Review and Notice of Final Public Meeting
- Appendix C4 Notice of Draft Site Plan Extension
- Appendix C5 Newspaper Tear Sheets
- Appendix D Public Consultation Materials
- Appendix D1 Public Meeting #1 (April 2012) Display Boards
- Appendix D2 Frequently Asked Questions for Public Meeting #1
- Appendix D3 Final Public Meeting (Fall 2012) Display Boards
- Appendix D4 Frequently Asked Questions for Final Public Meeting
- Appendix D5 Newspaper Columns
- Appendix D6 E-mail Public Notifications – Pembina Speaking Tour Event
- Appendix E Public Correspondence and Consideration by Project Team
- Appendix E1 Generic Letters Accompanying Mail-outs
- Appendix E2 Public Correspondence Record and Comment/Response Summary
- Appendix E3 Public Meeting #1(April 2012) Comment Form Summaries
- Appendix E4 Final Public Meeting (November and December 2012) Comment Form Summaries
- Appendix E5 Interest Groups and Non-Governmental Organizations Correspondence Record and Comment/Response Summary
- Appendix F Agency and Municipal Correspondence and Consideration by Project Team
- Appendix F1 Generic Letters/Emails
- Appendix F2 Federal Agencies Correspondence Record and Comment/Response Summary
- Appendix F3 Provincial Agencies Correspondence Record and Comment/Response Summary
- Appendix F4 Telecommunications and Radar System Providers Correspondence Record and Comment/Response Summary
- Appendix F5 Municipal Staff Correspondence Record and Comment/Response Summary
- Appendix F6 Project Update Report

## **Table of Contents**

---

Appendix G Aboriginal Community Correspondence and Consideration by Project Team

Appendix G1 Generic Letters/E-mails

Appendix G2 Aboriginal Community Correspondence Record and Comment/Response  
Summary

Appendix G3 Aboriginal Community Open House Comment Form Summaries

Appendix G4 Project Summary Report

Appendix G5 Aboriginal Community Open House #1 Display Boards

## **1.0 Introduction**

---

The information contained in this report is a summary of the key Renewable Energy Approval (REA) activities and documents prepared by Neegan Burnside on behalf of the Grand Bend Wind Limited Partnership, with Northland Power Inc. as agent.

### **1.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW**

Grand Bend Wind Limited Partnership, with Northland Power Inc. (“Northland”) as agent, are proposing to develop, construct and operate a 100 MW wind facility located north of Grand Bend, Ontario. An application for approval is being prepared under Ontario Regulation 359/09 of the Environmental Protection Act. The project is classified as a Class 4 Wind facility under the Regulation. The Grand Bend Wind Farm (“the Project”) is located in Huron County, spanning the lower-tier municipalities of Bluewater and Huron South. Portions of the transmission line also traverse the municipality of Huron East and municipality of West Perth in Perth County(**Appendix A1**).

The basic project components will include up to 48 turbines (Siemens SWT 2.3 113 direct drive wind turbine generators with a total name plate capacity of 100 MW), turbine access roads, a 36 kV electrical collection system, substation, a parts and storage (office/maintenance) building, a new transmission line within municipal road right-of ways (“ROWs”) along Sararas Road, Rodgerville Road, and Road 183 with connection to the provincial power grid at the 230 kV transmission line south of the Seaforth Transformer Station. During construction temporary components will include access roads and work/storage areas at the turbine locations and transmission connections.

A Renewable Energy Approval (REA) Application is being prepared, as required under Ontario Regulation 359/09 - Renewable Energy Approvals under Part V.0.1 of the Environmental Protection Act (O. Reg. 359/09).

### **1.2 REPORT REQUIREMENTS**

The purpose of this Consultation Report is to provide the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) with information on consultation activities that were conducted with respect to the Project. The Consultation Report documents how the Proponent consulted with the public, agencies, municipalities, Aboriginal communities, and other interested stakeholders. In addition, the Consultation Report documents any changes that were made and incorporated into the Project planning and design as a result of consultation activities.

The Consultation Report has been prepared in accordance with Item 2, Table 1 of O. Reg. 359/09 and the Ministry of the Environment’s (MOE’s) *Technical Guide to Renewable Energy Approvals* (MOE, March 2012).

O. Reg. 359/09 sets out specific content requirements for the Consultation Report as provided in the MOE’s Checklist for Requirements under O. Reg. 359/09.

The requirements of the Consultation Report, as prescribed in the Regulation, and the relevant sections where it can be found within this document are provided in **Table 1.1**.

**Table 1.1: Consultation Requirements (as per Ontario Regulation 359/09-Table 1)**

ID	Requirements	Section Number
<b>Set out information relating to consultations conducted in respect of the renewable energy project, including the following:</b>		
1.	A summary of communication with any members of the public, aboriginal communities, municipalities, local roads boards and Local Services Boards regarding the project.	Sections 5.0,6.0, and 7.0 Appendix E, F, and G
2.	Evidence that the information required to be distributed to aboriginal communities under subsection 17 (1) was distributed.	Section 7.1 and Appendix G2
3.	Any information provided by an aboriginal community in response to a request made under paragraph 4 of subsection 17 (1).	Section 7.2 and Appendix G2
4.	Evidence that a consultation form was distributed in accordance with subsection 18 (1).	Section 6.5 and Appendix F5
5.	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.	Section 6.5.2
6.	A description of whether and how, i. comments from members of the public, aboriginal communities, municipalities, local roads boards and Local Services Boards were considered by the person who is engaging in the project, ii. the documents that were made available under subsection 16 (5) were amended after the final public meeting was held, and iii. the proposal to engage in the project was altered in response to comments mentioned in subparagraph i.	Sections 5.0,6.0, and 7.0 Appendix E, F, and G  Section 5.6.2  Sections 5.0,6.0, and 7.0 Appendix E, F, and G
7.	A description of the manner in which the location of the wind turbines was made available to the public, if a person proposing to engage in a project in respect of a class 4 or 5 wind facility relied on paragraph 4 of subsection 54 (1.2) or paragraph 4 of subsection 55 (2.2).	Sections 4.3.2, and 5.3
8.	If paragraph 7 applies, proof of the date on which the location of the wind turbines referred to in that paragraph was made available to the public.	Appendix C5



## 2.0 Consultation Process

---

Consultation helps to ensure that concerns regarding the Project are identified early and addressed, where possible, in a transparent manner. Consultation is also used to identify potentially interested parties and the nature of their interest, inform these parties of the Project, and incorporate their concerns or interests into the planning and design process, to the extent possible and as appropriate. In addition, it allows for the development of relationships between Northland and interested parties, and establishes opportunities for invaluable feedback to the Project Team. The consultation process is designed to assist in the identification of potential environmental and socio-economic issues to ensure they are given appropriate consideration in Project planning, design, construction, operation and decommissioning.

Consultation for the Project included the mandatory requirements for consultation set out in O. Reg. 359/09. However, consultation is also an integral part of Northland's project planning process and is an internally mandated part of any project the company undertakes. Consultation plays a critical role in allowing Northland to learn about, understand and address the priorities and concerns identified by interested parties throughout the life of a project.

The objectives of the consultation process for the Project are as follows:

- Build and maintain community support and obtain relevant approvals for the Project;
- Ensure that relevant, accurate, and consistent information about the Project is provided to local Aboriginal communities, community members, members of the public, agencies and municipalities, as early as possible;
- Obtain/identify relevant information and local knowledge of local communities, municipalities, and Aboriginal communities;
- Identify potential issues and areas of concern that may arise from the Project;
- Address concerns by providing additional information, clarifying misconceptions, changing Project design, or making commitments, where appropriate in response to input and comments from the public, Aboriginal communities, municipalities, and agencies;
- Promote effective, proactive and responsive communications with the public, Aboriginal communities, municipalities and agencies;
- Resolve issues where possible, in a transparent manner;
- Track and document all communications between the Project Team and interested parties and ensure the information is incorporated into Project planning, to the extent possible and as appropriate; and,
- Demonstrate that Northland is committed to the well-being of the communities within which it works.

Consultation for the Project began early in the planning process and will continue throughout the design, development, construction, operation and decommissioning of the Project.

### **3.0 Overview of Communication Tools**

---

The following sections provide an overview of the tools used to communicate with the public, agencies, municipalities, and Aboriginal communities, and how these tools were used over the course of consultation for the Project.

#### **3.1 COMMUNICATION TOOLS USED FOR CONSULTATION**

The intent of the consultation process is to provide the community with an overview of the Project scope and apply community responses in all facets of the Project's design and development as early and transparently as possible. Therefore, Northland used various communication tools for disseminating Project information, and for ongoing collection of information from interested parties, including but not limited to, the public, Aboriginal communities, agencies and municipalities.

The communication tools used for the Project include:

- Project notices published in local newspapers;
- Direct mailings to assessed landowners in the general vicinity of the Project Study Area;
- Public Information Centres (Open House format);
- Public Information Centre comment forms;
- Project Community Newspaper Columns;
- A Project website (<http://grandbend.northlandpower.ca>)
- A Project e-mail address ([grandbendwind@neeganburnside.com](mailto:grandbendwind@neeganburnside.com));
- A Project telephone number (1-800-696-8093);
- Contact information for the applicant (Grand Bend Wind Limited Partnership, with Northland Power as agent) and their Consultants (Neegan Burnside and Stantec);
- Presentations to the senior staff and Clerks/CAO of the County of Huron, Perth County and the Municipalities of Bluewater, South Huron, Huron East and West Perth;
- Presentation to the Supervisor of Water and Planning and Regulations Coordinator and Officer of the Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority;
- Meetings with local Aboriginal communities staff and Community Open Houses for Aboriginal community members;
- Aboriginal Community Open House Comment Forms;
- Meetings, e-mails and phone conversations with agencies and local municipal staff; and,
- One-on-one meetings, e-mails and phone conversations with participating landowners and potentially affected landowners.

Contact information for Project representatives was included on all Project communications provided to the public. A Project website, e-mail, and toll-free telephone number will continue to remain active throughout the life of the Project.

### **3.2 STAKEHOLDER USE OF COMMUNICATION TOOLS**

Based on consultation activities between publication of the Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project (February 29, 2012) to the close of the public comment period for consideration in the REA Consultation Report (December 21, 2012), public comments have been received through the following channels:

- E-mails to Project e-mail address/ Project Team (received 68);
- Written letters to Project Team (received 6);
- Telephone Calls/Voice Messages to Project telephone number/Project Team (received 62);
- Feedback forms from Project website (received 12);
- First Public Meeting comment forms (received 34); and,
- Second Public Meeting comment forms (received 5).

Consultation activities were designed so that interested parties had an opportunity to provide comments and questions regarding the Project and these communications were summarized in comment and response tables which are included in this report (see **Appendix E, F and G**).

The Project Team responded to questions received during the consultation process through telephone calls, e-mails, 12 Project community newspaper columns, letters and one-on-one meetings as well as 2 rounds of Public Meetings held within 4 municipalities (i.e., the Municipalities of Bluewater, South Huron, Huron East and West Perth) in which the Project Location is situated for a total of eight Public Information Centres (open house format).

### **3.3 CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING**

All communications from participating landowners, assessed landowners and interested members of the public were documented and recorded in a database management system (Microsoft Access Database). This internal database allowed for the documentation of information regarding each interaction and activity including assessment roll and property information, name, date, contact information, affiliation, type of communication, and key issues or concerns raised.

All correspondences from agencies, municipalities, Aboriginal communities and other interested stakeholders were documented and recorded in summary tables with contact information, date and nature of the communication.

For the purposes of this Consultation Report, all personal information from public stakeholders (i.e., names, and contact information) has been removed, as per the federal *Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act* (PIPEDA). All original communication materials (contact records, letters, emails, comment forms from Public Information Centres, meeting minutes, etc.) has been filed electronically by Neegan Burnside, and is available at the MOE's request.

## **4.0 Notices of Project and Meetings**

---

### **4.1 PRE-DISCLOSURE**

Pre-disclosure includes advance notification of the Project prior to the issuance of the Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project. Pre-disclosure activities included correspondence with the appropriate federal, provincial and other agencies (such as Environment Canada's Canadian Wildlife Service, local Counties/Municipalities and Conservation Authorities) in October 2011 regarding natural heritage and geological information of the Project Study Area, in order to prepare the Natural Heritage Assessment Records Review Report in accordance with section 25 of O. Reg. 359/09.

On January 30, 2012, the Draft Project Description Report (PDR) was submitted to the MOE to obtain the Aboriginal Communities List issued under section 14 of O. Reg. 359/09 (**Section 4.2.5**). The MOE provided Northland with the Aboriginal Communities List on March 21, 2012.

Other pre-disclosure activities included correspondence with local municipal staff and some Aboriginal communities (see **Sections 6.0 and 7.0**) regarding an introductory meeting to discuss the Project, and with municipal staff to obtain contact information for assessed landowners within 550 m of the Project Study Area.

### **4.2 PROJECT DISTRIBUTION LIST**

A Project distribution list was developed in the early stages of the Project, and updated as required to identify key contacts that may have a potential interest in the Project. The Project distribution lists include provincial and federal agencies, municipalities, Aboriginal communities, participating landowners, assessed landowners in the general vicinity of the Project Study Area, and other interested stakeholders that had requested to be placed on the list throughout the REA process. Agency, municipal, Aboriginal and other interest groups and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) distribution lists are provided in **Appendix B**.

#### **4.2.1 Assessed Landowners**

Mailing information for assessed landowners was obtained from municipal property assessment information. O.Reg.359/09 requires that landowners within 550 m of the Project Location be contacted, in addition to assessed owners of land abutting a parcel of land on which the Project Location is situated. This information was obtained for the Project Study Area, a larger area than the notification area required by O. Reg. 359/09. The assessed landowners for this larger area were included on the Project distribution list to ensure that potentially interested parties received information about the Project. A map showing the parcels of land considered in the assessed landowner distribution list, including the 550 m notification area is provided in **Appendix B1**.

#### **4.2.2 Participating Landowners**

Participating landowners (i.e., individuals who have a Land Lease Agreement with Northland) were added to the Project distribution list and informed of any Project layout changes. They were asked to provide feedback with respect to the layout and land preparation requirements for the Archaeological Assessment.

#### **4.2.3 Federal and Provincial Agencies**

O. Reg. 359/09 identifies agencies that are required to be consulted on the Project, including the MOE (Director and District Manager), the secretary of every company operating an oil or natural gas pipeline if the pipeline right of way is within 200 metres of the Project Location, the Land Use Office of NAV Canada, and Transport Canada's Regional Office for Ontario. The agencies as identified to be consulted were included on the Project distribution list, as required by O. Reg. 359/09.

In addition, agencies that typically and historically have had an interest in environmental assessment and/or wind projects were added to the Project distribution list. These include agencies that may issue permits or approvals for the Project, as well as agencies that may have an interest in learning about and/or commenting on the Project.

The agency distribution list is provided in **Appendix B2**.

#### **4.2.4 Municipalities and Elected Officials**

The Clerks for the Counties of Huron and Perth (upper-tier municipalities) as well as the Municipalities of South Huron, Bluewater, Huron East and West Perth (lower-tier or local municipalities) were included on the Project distribution list, as required by O. Reg. 359/09.

In addition, other groups or local representatives were included on the Project distribution list:

- Municipal staff identified as the point of contact for background information or input to the Municipal Consultation Form;
- Chief Administrative Officer for Perth County and the Municipalities of Bluewater, South Huron, and West Perth; and,
- Member of Parliament (MP) and Member of Provincial Parliament (MPP) for Huron-Bruce.

The municipal and elected officials' distribution list is provided in **Appendix B3**.

#### **4.2.5 Aboriginal Communities**

On January 30, 2012, as per O. Reg. 359/09, the Draft Project Description Report (PDR) was sent to the Director of the MOE in order to obtain the Aboriginal Communities List as per section 14 of O. Reg. 359/09. The list was received from the MOE on March 21, 2012.

Prior to receiving the Aboriginal Consultation List for the Project from MOE, Neegan Burnside developed a contact list of Aboriginal Communities based on professional judgement, which included a focus on communities within 150 km of the Project Study Area. The Project Distribution List was updated to reflect the information provided by the MOE on March 21, 2012. See **Section 7.0** for a detailed description of the activities undertaken as part of the Aboriginal consultation.

The Aboriginal community distribution list is provided in **Appendix B4**.

#### **4.2.6 Other Interested Stakeholders**

Members of the public that expressed an interest in the Project were added to the Project distribution list throughout the REA process.

In addition, interest groups including community organizations/associations, as well as non-governmental organizations (NGOs), were also added to the Project distribution list and provided with information on the Project. Key interest groups and NGOs were consulted regarding potential species records in the Study Area and key issues in the community.

Some of the largest oil and natural gas companies (i.e., Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. and Union Gas Limited) were included on the Project distribution list. In addition, other major telecommunication providers (i.e., Rogers Communication Inc. and TELUS Communications) were added to the Project distribution list to determine whether any of their facilities are present in the Project Study Area.

The interest group and NGO distribution list is provided in **Appendix B5**.

#### **4.2.7 Updates to the Project Distribution List**

The Project distribution list was updated throughout the REA process, primarily as a result of attendance at Public Meetings, where an attendee could indicate their desire to be included on the Project distribution list when signing into the Public Meeting, and also when completing the contact information section in the Public Meeting comment form.

In addition, Project distribution lists updates took places as a result of requests received via e-mail, telephone calls and personal interactions. At an individual's request, a name was either added to or removed from the Project distribution list. Changes to the list for agencies, municipalities and Aboriginal communities were generally made by the Project Team at the



direction of these groups. Exceptions were the updates as the result of information received from Canada Post or Purolator from previous mailings.

### **4.3 NOTICES**

Project Notices were published in local newspapers and mailed or e-mailed to the Project distribution list, including federal and provincial agencies, local municipalities, Aboriginal communities, assessed landowners in the general vicinity of the Project Study Area, and other interested stakeholders that had requested to be placed on the list throughout the REA process.

#### **4.3.1 Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project**

The combined Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project was published in five local newspapers on at least two publication dates in February and March 2012. The Notice was first published on February 29, 2012, more than thirty (30) days prior to the first Public Information Centre (PIC) of April 2, 2012. The Notice included a brief description of the Project proposal including a map of the Project Location and provided information about the PICs and locations where the Draft Project Description Report was made available for public review and comment. Newspaper publication of the Notice is summarized in **Section 4.4**.

The Notice was directly mailed or e-mailed where preferred on February 23, 2012 to municipalities and Aboriginal communities and on February 27, 2012 to federal and provincial agencies, and assessed landowners within the Project Study Area. Since the MOE Director's Aboriginal Communities List had not yet been received, the Notice and the Draft Project Description Report (PDR) was distributed to the Aboriginal communities identified by Neegan Burnside, as described in **Section 7.1**.

As the Project distribution list was updated, the Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) was sent (in some instances re-sent as a result of undeliverable mail due to incorrect and/or incomplete mailing addresses) in March 2012 to federal and provincial agencies, Aboriginal communities and potentially affected landowners that may not have received the Notice in the initial mailing. Aboriginal communities not previously identified were sent the Draft PDR on March 23, 2012.

The Notice and the Draft PDR were posted on the Project website on February 9, 2012 and February 28, 2012, respectively, more than thirty (30) days prior to the first PIC date of April 2, 2012.

A copy of the Notice can be found in **Appendix C1**.

#### **4.3.2 Notice of Draft Site Plan**

The Notice of Draft Site Plan informed stakeholders about the release of the turbine layout and crystallization of the noise receptors as well as provided information about the locations where the Draft Site Plan Report was made available for public review and comment. The Notice was published in five local newspapers on two publication dates in April 2012. The Notice was first published on April 18, 2012 and distributed in accordance with sections 15 and 54 of O. Reg. 359/09. Newspaper publication of the Notice is summarized in **Section 4.4**.

The Notice was directly mailed or e-mailed where preferred, on April 17, 19 and 20, 2012 to:

- the MOE Director and District Manager;
- Oil and Gas companies;
- Land use office of NAV Canada;
- Transport Canada's Regional Office for Ontario;
- Ministry of Transportation;
- Local Counties/Municipalities;
- Aboriginal communities list (identified in the MOE's Aboriginal Consultation List); and,
- Assessed landowners within the Project Study Area and other interested members of the public that had requested to be placed on the Project distribution list throughout the REA process.

The Draft Site Plan Report was mailed on April 19, 2012 to the MOE Director and each Aboriginal Community identified in the MOE's Aboriginal Consultation List.

The Notice of Draft Site Plan and the Draft Site Plan Report were posted on the Project Website on April 17, 2012 and April 20, 2012, respectively.

A copy of the Notice can be found in **Appendix C2**.

#### **4.3.3 Notice of Draft REA Reports Public Review and Notice of Final Public Meeting**

The Notice of Draft REA Reports Public Review and Notice of Final Public Meeting was published in four newspapers on two publication dates in September and October 2012. The Notice was first published on September 26, 2012 as per O.Reg.359/09. The Notice included information about the Final Public Meeting and locations where the Draft REA Reports were made available for public review and comment. Newspaper publication of the Notice is summarized in **Section 4.4**.

The Notice was directly mailed or e-mailed where preferred, on September 24, 2012 to federal and provincial agencies, municipalities, Aboriginal communities, assessed landowners within

Project Study Area and other interested stakeholders that had requested to be on the list throughout the REA process.

The Notice of Draft REA Reports Public Review and Notice of Final Public Meeting and the Draft REA Reports (excluding the Consultation Report) were posted on the Project website on September 25, 2012 and September 26, 2012, respectively.

A copy of the Notice can be found in **Appendix C3**.

#### **4.3.4 Notice of Draft Site Plan Extension**

On September 6, 2012 Northland requested an extension to the time required to submit a REA application for the Project. The request for a time extension for the Project was granted on October 17, 2012 by the MOE Director as the Ministry believed all reasonable efforts were made by Northland to submit a REA application within the six-month period referred to in subsection 54 (1.4) of O. Reg. 359/09 but were unable due to delays in completing the Stage 2 archaeological investigations and fieldwork for natural heritage studies. As a result of the extension granted, a Notice of Draft Site Plan Extension was distributed in accordance with section 54.1 (c) of O. Reg. 359/09.

The Notice was published in four local newspapers on October 31, 2012. The Notice stated that the noise receptors defined in the Draft Site Plan dated April 18, 2012 will remain exclusively those considered for the Project provided the REA application is submitted on or before July 31, 2013. The Notice also provided an update with regard to the Project layout and information about the locations where the Draft REA Reports including the Project Update Report and the Director's Letter of Extension mentioned above were made available for public review and comment. Newspaper publication of the Notice is summarized in **Section 4.4**.

The Notice was directly mailed or e-mailed where preferred, on October 29, 2012 to federal and provincial agencies, municipalities, Aboriginal communities, assessed landowners within the Project Study Area and other interested stakeholders that had requested to be on the list throughout the REA process.

The Project Update Report, MOE Director's Letter of Extension, and Notice were posted on the Project Website on September 28, 2012, October 17, 2012 and October 24, 2012, respectively.

A copy of the Notice can be found in **Appendix C4**.

#### **4.4 SUMMARY OF NEWSPAPER PUBLICATION OF NOTICES**

A summary of the dates and newspapers in which Project Notices were published is provided in **Table 4.1**. Proof of publication of each Notice is provided in **Appendix C5**.

**Table 4.1: Summary of Newspaper Notices**

<b>Newspaper</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Notice of Proposal and Notice Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Project</b>	<b>Notice of Draft Site Plan</b>	<b>Notice of Draft REA Reports Public Review and Notice of Final Public Meeting</b>	<b>Notice of Draft Site Plan Extension</b>
<i>The Lakeshore Advance</i>	One-day-a-week publication (Wednesday) serving the Grand Bend, Dashwood and Zurich areas.	February 29, March 14 and March 28, 2012	April 18 and April 25, 2012	September 26 and October 3, 2012	October 31, 2012
<i>Clinton News Record</i>	One-day-a-week publication (Wednesday) serving the Clinton, Bayfield and Blyth areas.	February 29, March 14 and March 28, 2012	April 18 and April 25, 2012	September 26 and October 3, 2012	October 31, 2012
<i>Seaforth Huron Expositor</i>	One-day-a-week publication (Wednesday) serving the Seaforth, Kippen and Walton areas.	March 14 and March 28, 2012	April 18 and April 25, 2012	September 26 and October 3, 2012	October 31, 2012
<i>Mitchell Advocate</i>	One-day-a-week publication (Wednesday) serving the Mitchell, Fullarton and Monkton areas.	February 29, March 14 and March 28, 2012	April 18 and April 25, 2012	September 26 and October 3, 2012	October 31, 2012
<i>Exeter Times Advocate</i>	Two-days-a-week publication (Wednesday and Friday) serving the Exeter area.	March 23 and March 28, 2012	April 18 and April 20, 2012	N/A*	N/A*

\* Two alternative transmission routes were initially assessed as part of the REA process; however the preferred transmission line route along Sararas/Rodgerville Road to Line 17, Road 183 and connecting to the 230 kV Hydro One transmission line just south of the Seaforth Transformer Station was selected based on population density, environmental considerations, and cost issues. As the second alternative route was dropped, no Project components were located within the Exeter area and therefore no additional Notices were published in the Exeter Times Advocate newspaper following the issuance of the Notice of Draft Site Plan.

## **5.0 Public Consultation**

---

### **5.1 OVERVIEW**

An extensive public consultation program was undertaken for the Project, including:

- Maintaining the Project distribution list;
- Distributing required notices;
- Publishing newspaper advertisements;
- Publishing Project Community Newspaper Columns;
- Hosting two Public Meetings within 4 municipalities for a total of eight Public Information Centres (PICs); and,
- Responding to members of the public who had questions, issues, or concerns or positive feedback about the Project.

The public consultation activities undertaken for the Project are more fully described in the sections below.

### **5.2 PUBLIC MEETINGS**

#### **5.2.1 General Description of Public Meetings**

Two Public Meetings were held within 4 municipalities (i.e., the municipalities of Bluewater, South Huron, Huron East and West Perth) in which the Project Location is situated for a total of eight PICs. Venue selection for the PICs took into consideration a number of criteria, including location, accessibility and venue size to accommodate large numbers of community members who wished to attend. The meetings were held in the evenings, to allow the largest number of people to attend at their convenience.

The PICs were held in a drop-in style open house format, where information about the Project was provided through large display boards that were posted on easels placed around the room or facility. Members of the Project Team were available to provide additional information about the Project, to discuss the content of the display boards, and to answer questions related to the Project within their area of expertise and seek attendees' feedback regarding the Project.

At each PIC, attendees were greeted, asked to sign the registration sheet and provided with a comment form. During the PICs, participants were encouraged to complete and submit the comment forms at the PIC or return them before the date specified using the contact information provided on the comment form.

The comment forms asked participants to indicate their property type and/or interest in the Project as well as document their general comments, issues or suggestions regarding the Project.

The information gathered by the Project Team through discussions with attendees and comment sheets are provided in a summary of public correspondence in **Appendix E**. Feedback gathered at these sessions was considered by the Project Team during preparation of the REA Reports and during Project planning and siting, to the greatest extent possible and as appropriate.

**5.2.2 Public Meeting #1 – April 2012**

Prior to Public Meeting #1, the Project website was updated on March 30, 2012 with the display boards, comment form and a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) Sheet. The FAQ sheet addressed some of the most common questions or concerns raised by assessed landowners and interested members of the public following the issuance of the combined Notice of Proposal and Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project. The FAQ sheet provided information on the REA process, Northland, environmental studies that were underway (and would be undertaken in the near future), benefits of wind energy including community benefits and key wind energy issues (i.e., property values, health and tourism) (see **Appendix D2**).

The purpose of Public Meeting #1 was to introduce the Project and Project Team to the community, with the intention of providing information as early in the process as possible. Public Meeting #1 provided the opportunity for community members to learn about the Project and the REA process, to ask questions of the Project Team (9 Project Team members were in attendance), and to provide input into the Project. This allowed the Project team to consider comments, issues and concerns early in the Project lifecycle, to the extent possible and as appropriate.

Key information about Public Meeting #1 held in April 2012 is presented in **Table 5.1**.

**Table 5.1: Public Meeting #1: Key Information**

<b>Municipality</b>	Municipality of West Perth, Perth County	Municipality of South Huron, Huron County	Municipality of Bluewater, Huron County	Municipality of Huron East, Huron County
<b>Date PIC Held</b>	April 2, 2012	April 3, 2012	April 5, 2012	April 12, 2012
<b>Location</b>	Mitchell District Arena & Community Centre 185 Wellington St., Mitchell, ON N0K 1N0	Dashwood Community Centre 158 Centre St., Dashwood, ON N0M 1N0	Bluewater Community Centre/ Zurich Arena 15 East St., Zurich, ON N0M 2T0	Seaforth and District Community Centre 122 Duke Street, Seaforth, ON N0K 1W0
<b>Attendees</b>	36 attendees (35 attendees signed in)	79 attendees (71 attendees signed in)	83 attendees (56 attendees signed in)	16 attendees signed in
<b>Comment Forms</b>	7	15	9 comment forms and 1 follow up e-mail	3 comment forms and 1 follow up e-mail

**Table 5.1: Public Meeting #1: Key Information**

Received				
<b>Information Presented and Made Available</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 29 information display boards (see <b>Appendix D1</b>);</li> <li>• 9 Project Team members including 3 Northland representatives with relevant expertise to answer questions personally;</li> <li>• Draft Project Description Report (February 2012);</li> <li>• Project sign-in sheets;</li> <li>• Hard copies of the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) Sheet for Public Information Centre #1 (see <b>Appendix D2</b>);</li> <li>• Reference Materials (Binders containing academic and industry studies related to wind projects, CanWEA Fact Sheets, and relevant media clippings).</li> </ul>			

Display boards provided background information on Northland, an overview of the Project and the REA process, the Project schedule, a description of the Project’s facility components and activities, the results of the sound level assessment and a summary of the potential environmental negative impacts and preliminary mitigation measures. Relevant academic and industry studies and pertinent media clippings were also made available for attendees to review and discuss with the Project Team.

Public Meeting #1 attendees were encouraged to provide input by completing the available comment forms. If attendees wished to take the comment forms home to complete later, they were asked to return their comments either by mail, e-mail or fax (provided on the comment form) by April 27, 2012. Attendees who completed a comment form with contact information and questions or comments regarding the Project were mailed or e-mailed (based on preference) an individually addressed response with more information about their specific question or concern.

Information captured from Public Meeting #1 was considered in appropriate sections of the REA and considered by the Project Team during Project planning and siting, to the extent possible and as appropriate. All comments received from Public Meeting #1, responses provided, and a description of how comments were considered by the Project Team, are provided in **Appendix E3**. A copy of Public Meeting #1 display boards are provided in **Appendix D1**.

**5.2.3 Final Public Meeting – November and December 2012**

The purpose of the Final Public Meeting was to provide an update on the Project to community members, including the proposed layout, the results of the REA studies and the Draft REA Reports, and to gather feedback (**Table 5.2**).

Key information about the Final Public Meeting held in late November and early December 2012 is presented in **Table 5.2**.



**Table 5.2: Final Public Meeting: Key Information**

<b>Municipality</b>	Municipality of West Perth, Perth County	Municipality of Bluewater, Huron County	Municipality of South Huron, Huron County	Municipality of Huron East, Huron County
<b>Date PIC Held</b>	November 28, 2012	November 29, 2012	December 3, 2012	December 4, 2012
<b>Location</b>	Mitchell District Arena & Community Centre 185 Wellington St., Mitchell, ON N0K 1N0	Bluewater Community Centre/ Zurich Arena 15 East St., Zurich, ON N0M 2T0	Dashwood Community Centre 158 Centre St., Dashwood, ON N0M 1N0	Seaforth and District Community Centre 122 Duke Street, Seaforth, ON N0K 1W0
<b>Attendees</b>	10 attendees (7 attendees signed in)	28 attendees (26 attendees signed in)	7 attendees (5 attendees signed in)	16 attendees (13 attendees signed in)
<b>Comment Forms Received</b>	1	1 comment form and 1 follow-up e-mail	1	2
<b>Information Presented and Made Available</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 47 information display boards (see <b>Appendix D3</b>);</li> <li>• 14 Project Team members including at least 5 Northland representatives with relevant expertise to answer questions personally;</li> <li>• Draft REA Reports including the Project Summary and Project Update Reports (public review versions, August and September 2012);</li> <li>• Project sign-in sheets;</li> <li>• Hard copies of the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) Sheet (see <b>Appendix D4</b>);</li> <li>• Reference Materials (Binders including Academic and industry studies related to wind projects; CanWEA Fact Sheets, and relevant media clippings).</li> </ul>			

Display boards provided background information on Northland, an overview of the Project and the REA process, the Project schedule, results of the Noise Assessment, Visual Simulations, REA environmental studies, Health considerations, the transmission line route, a summary of the potential effects and mitigation measures and a list of any changes in the Project as a result of feedback received. Relevant academic and industry studies and pertinent media clippings were also made available for attendees to review and discuss with the Project Team. In addition to these consultation materials, attendees were provided with another FAQ sheet at the Final Public Meeting. The FAQ sheet provided additional background information about the Project, an explanation of the importance of wind energy to Ontario, the economic benefits of wind power, and addressed key potential impacts of the Project on residents and the natural environment (see **Appendix D4**).

Final Public Meeting attendees were encouraged to provide input by completing the available comment forms. If attendees wished to take the comment forms home to complete later, they were asked to return their comments either by mail, e-mail or fax (provided on the comment form) by December 21, 2012. Attendees who completed a comment form with contact information and questions or comments regarding the Project were mailed or e-mailed (based on preference) an individually addressed response with more information about their specific question or concern.

Information captured from the Final Public Meeting was considered during the finalizing of the final REA Reports to the greatest extent possible and as appropriate. All comments received from the Final Public Meeting, responses provided, and a description of how comments were



considered by the Project Team, are provided in **Appendix E4**. A copy of the Final Public Meeting display boards are provided in **Appendix D3**.

### **5.3 RELEASE OF DRAFT REA REPORTS**

To meet the requirements under subsection 16 (5) of O. Reg. 359/09, Draft REA Reports were made available for public review and comment, including:

- A draft Project Description Report (dated February 2012) was posted to the Project website on February 9, 2012 and hard copies were made available to the public at the public review locations (see **Table 5.3**) as of February 29, 2012, at least thirty (30) days before the first PIC date of April 2, 2012. The Draft Project Description Report was also made available for public review at Public Meeting #1.
- The Draft Site Plan Report (dated April 2012) was posted to the Project website on April 20, 2012 and hard copies were made available to the public at the public review locations (see **Table 5.3**) on that same day.
- On September 26, 2012 the following draft versions of the REA Reports (with the exception of the Consultation Report and the Letters from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport and the Ministry of Natural Resources in respect of the report approvals) were made available on the Project website and at the public review locations (see **Table 5.3**) for public review:
  - Project Description Report;
  - Construction Plan Report;
  - Design and Operations Report (including visual simulations);
  - Decommissioning Plan Report;
  - Wind Turbine Specifications Report;
  - Natural Heritage Assessment;
    - Records Review Report;
    - Site Investigation Report;
    - Evaluation of Significance Report; and,
    - Environmental Impact Study.
  - Natural Heritage Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan Report
  - Water Assessment and Water Body Report;
  - Noise Assessment Report;
  - Telecommunication Impact Study Report;
  - Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Report; and,
  - Heritage Assessment Report.

The Draft REA Reports were also made available for public inspection at the Final Public Meeting. The Draft REA Reports will remain on the Project website until the MOE deems the

REA application for the Project complete, at which time the website will be updated with the final versions of the REA Reports.

- A Project Update Report (dated September 2012) was posted to the Project website on September 28, 2012 and hard copies were made available to the public at the public review locations (see **Table 5.3**) on September 27, 2012. The report is an addendum to the Draft REA Reports issued to the MOE, selected agencies, municipalities and Aboriginal communities on August 27, 2012 (start date for the 90 day municipal and Aboriginal communities' consultation period). The report informed public stakeholders of Project changes as of September 26, 2012, more than 60 days prior to the second PIC date of November 28, 2012. The Project Update Report was also made available for review at the Final Public Meeting.
- The Project Summary Report prepared in accordance with section 17 of O. Reg. 359/09 for the Aboriginal communities, was provided for public review at the Final Public Meeting for the interest of the local community (this was circulated to aboriginal communities 90-days prior to the Final Public Meeting, at the same time as the Municipal circulation).

### 5.3.1 Summary of Public Review Locations for Draft REA Reports

A summary of the public review locations for the Draft REA Reports is provided in **Table 5.3**.

**Table 5.3: Summary of Public Review Locations for Draft REA Reports**

Draft REA Reports Made Available At:	Address
Huron County Municipal Office	1 Courthouse Square, Goderich, ON N7A 1M2
Perth County Municipal Office	1 Huron Street, Stratford, ON N5A 5S4
Municipality of West Perth Municipal Office	169 St. David Street, Mitchell, ON N0K 1N0
Municipality of South Huron Municipal Office	322 Main Street South, Exeter, ON N0M 1S6
Municipality off Bluewater Municipal Office	14 Mill Avenue, Zurich, ON N0M 2T0
Municipality of Huron East Municipal Office	72 Main Street South, Seaforth, ON N0K 1W0

## 5.4 ADDITIONAL PUBLIC CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES

### 5.4.1 Project Community Newspaper Columns

Northland published twelve newspaper columns (or articles) in the Lakeshore Advance and Exeter Times Advocate newspapers from June to December 2012. The newspaper columns were also posted on the Project website. The purpose of each newspaper column was to provide information about wind energy including the Project and responses to common questions received by the local community to date. Each article provided contact information for the Project and encouraged the reader to communicate with Northland should they have any questions.

A summary of each newspaper column and the dates the newspaper columns were published in the newspapers and made available on the website is provided in **Table 5.4**. A copy of each of the community newspaper column can be found in **Appendix D5**

**Table 5.4: Summary of Community Newspaper Columns**

<b>Newspaper Column No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Date Published in The Lakeshore Advance Newspaper</b>	<b>Date Published in The Exeter Times Advocate Newspaper</b>	<b>Date Posted on Project Website</b>
1	The Wind-Powering Change in Grand Bend and Ontario	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided background information on the historic uses of wind resources and the Government of Ontario commitment to phase out coal use at electricity generating stations in the province by 2014.</li> <li>• Provided the purpose of the bi-weekly columns, an introduction to Northland, and reasons for selecting the Project site.</li> <li>• Clarified the role of Neegan Burnside with respect to the Project.</li> <li>• Northland provided an update regarding meetings held with local municipalities and community members to date and noted that they are committed to continuing this dialogue.</li> </ul>	July 4, 2012	July 4, 2012	June 29, 2012
2	Wind Sounds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided information related to the noise setback requirements for wind facilities in Ontario, and existing studies that have concluded that there is no direct link impact from wind turbine noise on human health.</li> <li>• Provided the link to the MOE website to learn how Ontario's setback distances were determined, how wind turbine noise is measured, and for access to studies reviewed by the MOE when developing O. Reg. 359/09.</li> </ul>	July 25, 2012	July 25, 2012	July 20, 2012
3	Wind and Wildlife	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addressed a major concern of the public regarding the impacts of wind energy on wildlife.</li> <li>• Explained how the proper siting of a wind turbine may minimize the risk to wildlife.</li> <li>• Provided an overview of the Natural Heritage Assessment process to be followed for renewable energy projects, and field studies and ecological inventories that were undertaken for the Natural Heritage Assessment Report.</li> <li>• Provided data from a valid statistical study on the causes of bird deaths. The study cited that for every</li> </ul>	August 8, 2012	August 8, 2012	August 2, 2012

**Table 5.4: Summary of Community Newspaper Columns**

<b>Newspaper Column No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Date Published in The Lakeshore Advance Newspaper</b>	<b>Date Published in The Exeter Times Advocate Newspaper</b>	<b>Date Posted on Project Website</b>
		10,000 bird deaths, only one is caused by wind turbines compared to 1,060 deaths caused by domestic cats and 5,820 from crashing into buildings and windows (Source CanWEA).			
4	The True Cost of Renewable Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained the current global and local need for clean and renewable energy sources.</li> <li>Provided an overview of the FIT program in Ontario and successful FIT programs in other countries.</li> <li>Explained the economic advantages of investing in renewable energy.</li> </ul>	August 22, 2012	August 22, 2012	August 17, 2012
5	Where the Wind Blows-Determining Turbine Locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained the factors that were considered in siting the wind farm in Grand Bend, Ontario.</li> <li>Explained how turbines are selected and why the Siemens 2.3 MW wind turbine generator will be used for the Project.</li> </ul>	September 5, 2012	September 5, 2012	August 30, 2012
6	Proponent Responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained the role and responsibilities of the energy developer.</li> <li>Provided an overview of O. Reg. 359/09 and the requirements of developers with respect to the Regulation.</li> <li>Northland noted other responsibilities in addition to the REA requirements, which includes obtaining permits/approvals from local municipal authority.</li> <li>Explained that the decommissioning plan will be implemented in the event of termination or expiry of Northland's contract with the Ontario Power Authority (OPA).</li> <li>Northland noted that they are committed to being a good neighbour and will continue to cooperate with local municipalities throughout the Project's lifespan.</li> </ul>	September 19, 2012	September 19, 2012	September 14, 2012
7	Powering Sustainable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided information on the economic, environmental and community benefits of wind power.</li> </ul>	October 3, 2012	October 3, 2012	September 28, 2012

**Table 5.4: Summary of Community Newspaper Columns**

<b>Newspaper Column No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Date Published in The Lakeshore Advance Newspaper</b>	<b>Date Published in The Exeter Times Advocate Newspaper</b>	<b>Date Posted on Project Website</b>
	Communities				
8	Renewable Energy Approvals Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided an overview of the FIT program and REA requirements that must be satisfied before a permit is issued.</li> <li>• Provided a status update on the Project’s REA application.</li> </ul>	October 17, 2012	October 17, 2012	October 11, 2012
9	Wind Energy and the Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explained the role of wind energy in combating climate change.</li> <li>• Explained how wind power consumes no water and generates no emissions including greenhouse gases that are emitted by fossil fuel electric generation.</li> </ul>	October 31, 2012	October 31, 2012	October 25, 2012
10	The Evolution of Wind Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided a brief summary of how early civilizations harnessed wind resources.</li> <li>• Described the history of large scale wind energy conversion and the gradual improvement of the commercial wind turbine.</li> </ul>	November 14, 2012	November 14, 2012	November 9, 2012
11	Public Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided an overview of the Public Consultation process, details of the second set of meetings to be held late November and early December 2012, purpose of these meetings, and an outline of the meeting format (open house).</li> </ul>	November 28, 2012	November 28, 2012	November 23, 2012
12	Summary of Public Consultation Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided responses to some frequently asked questions at the second set of meetings.</li> <li>• Provided a summary of the changes made to the Project as a result of feedback from the local community.</li> </ul>	December 12, 2012	December 12, 2012	December 7, 2012

## **5.5 CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS**

### **5.5.1 Public**

The information collected through the above consultation activities assisted the Project Team in developing a list of comments regarding the Project and assisted the Proponent in gaining invaluable input into the design and planning of the Project. Comments received were reviewed by the Project Team and considered during Project siting and planning, and during preparation of the REA Reports.

A summary of the key public comments and how comments were considered by the Project Team is provided in **Table 5.5**, including whether:

- the Project or study design was altered in response to comments received;
- the REA Reports were amended based on comments received; and/or
- additional information was provided.

A detailed summary of each comment received from the public, and each response from the Project Team from the start of the REA consultation process in February 2012 to January 2013 is provided in **Appendix E2**.

**Table 5.5: Summary of Key and Frequent Comments from Public and Consideration by Project Team**

Key and Frequent Comments	Project Response	How Comments were considered by Project Team
<b>Noise and Visual Considerations</b>		
How loud is a wind turbine, and how does varying wind speed effect its sound?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You can stand directly beneath an operating turbine and carry on a conversation without raising your voice.</li> <li>• As wind speeds increase:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The ambient (background) noise levels at the receptor may increase due wind effects, which may mask and effectively lessen the perceived sound of the turbines.</li> <li>○ At all wind speeds, the immission level from the turbines at all non-participating noise receptors will not exceed 40 dBA.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considered in the Noise Assessment Report</li> </ul>
How tall are the wind turbines and how far away can they be seen?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Grand Bend Wind Farm turbines have the following height profile:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 99.5 m hub height (measured from the ground to the centre of the rotor).</li> <li>○ 113 m rotor diameter (the hub is at the centre of the rotor).</li> <li>○ Therefore the total height from the ground to the blade tip when a blade is aligned vertically is 156 m.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• While the extent to which the turbines can be seen depends on the location of the observer, the topography, and presence of visual obstacles, visual simulations are available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considered in the Design and Operations Report and views shown in the Visual Simulations provided in Appendix E of that report.</li> </ul>
Will the turbines affect local tourism?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All turbines are located east of Bluewater Highway (#21) and should not negatively affect local tourism.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of reports indirectly address this issue including our response to various queries concerning the subject. The Design and Operations Report includes a visual simulation of the wind farm. The Cultural Heritage Report addressed a related issue. It is possible that the wind farm could be a tourist draw.</li> </ul>
Will the turbines be equipped with blinking lights operating at all times?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The turbines are required to have lighting in accordance with Transport Canada requirements for air traffic safety.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Subject to Transport Canada approval, Northland will install a radar system that will control the obstruction lighting, such that the lights will only be on when a plane is in the vicinity of the Project. Based on the data available, it is estimated that the resulting lighting would be reduced to less than 10% of night time hours.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subject to Transport Canada's approval, the frequency and duration of blinking lights will be limited at this wind farm</li> </ul>
What is shadow flicker and how does it occur?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Turbine "shadow flicker" occurs during certain times of the day and year when the turbine blades are located between the sun and a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problems with shadow flicker are not anticipated, given that the minimum distance from a turbine to a</li> </ul>



**Table 5.5: Summary of Key and Frequent Comments from Public and Consideration by Project Team**

Key and Frequent Comments	Project Response	How Comments were considered by Project Team
	receptor.	receptor is greater than 550 m; however, if an issue develops, Northland has indicated that it will deal with each one on a case-by case basis, as required.
<b>Potential Health Effects</b>		
How do wind farms affect my health?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall, health and medical agencies agree that when sited properly, wind turbines are not causally related to adverse effects.</li> <li>Reports of annoyance by people living around wind turbines appear to be more related to variables like personal attitude and whether a person can see a turbine from their home and not a turbine-specific variable like noise.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland and the Neegan Burnside team have presented substantial information concerning this subject on the Project website, in public meetings, FAQ's, news articles and our reports. Intrinsic, a specialist firm, was retained to provide the most up to date information to the public and Aboriginal communities.</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Environment</b>		
How was the natural environment assessed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are many natural environment studies that have been completed as well as others that are currently underway to accurately characterize the existing natural environment within the study area. Our team is working closely with the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and the Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority (ABCA), with the ultimate aim of ensuring minimal impacts to the natural environment as a result of the Project.</li> <li>In addition, we will be working with Environment Canada (EC)/Canadian Wildlife Service (CWS) to address any federally designated species.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extensive natural heritage studies were undertaken in the Study Area between 2011, 2012 and continuing into 2013. There will also be ongoing monitoring during construction and operation.</li> </ul>
Will birds and bats be affected? Will there be effects on Tundra Swans?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We did contact Dr. Scott Petrie (recommended to us by local residents) to obtain some additional information with regard to Tundra Swans.</li> <li>To date suitable habitat for the Tundra Swan has not been located within 120m of the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Studies and operational plans for the Project have been established to minimize impacts on birds and bats.</li> </ul>
How will the environment be protected?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field studies were undertaken and analyzed to prepare a Natural Heritage Assessment for the Project. The Natural Heritage Assessment includes mitigation measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts to the environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential impacts to the environment have been assessed through the Natural Heritage Assessment, and mitigation measures have been developed to avoid or minimize those potential impacts.</li> </ul>

**Table 5.5: Summary of Key and Frequent Comments from Public and Consideration by Project Team**

Key and Frequent Comments	Project Response	How Comments were considered by Project Team
<b>Property Value</b>		
What is being done to protect the housing market in the area of the turbines?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multiple studies have consistently found no evidence that wind energy projects are negatively impacting property values.</li> <li>Some of these studies can be found on the Project website: <a href="http://grandbend.northlandpower.ca">http://grandbend.northlandpower.ca</a>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our Project Team has relied on credible studies on property value from other projects in Ontario and elsewhere. Our FAQ's on the website has relayed this information to stakeholders in the Study Area.</li> </ul>
<b>Electricity Distribution</b>		
How will stray voltage be addressed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland will ensure that the design will meet or exceed Hydro One, Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO), Ontario Energy Board (OEB), Ontario Grid Control Centre (OGCC), and Electrical Safety Authority (ESA) requirements. They will ensure that electrical components will be tested and commissioned to ensure safe operation prior to Project operation. The electrical system will be monitored during operation to ensure continued safe operation. Northland will also install protection and control devices that will automatically shut down operations if unsafe conditions are detected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project Team will ensure that Project electrical standards meet or exceed requirements and will be monitored to confirm standards are being met.</li> </ul>
Will the transmission line be built on new or existing hydro poles?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland is in consideration of both above and underground transmission lines. Should the line be established above ground, new utility poles will be required to achieve the regulated heights and setbacks associated with the 230 kV higher voltage line. All 36 kV collector lines will be installed underground.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project Team has heard suggestions from many stakeholders that they would like an underground electrical transmission system. Northland has committed to an underground collector system and continues to review the potential of an underground 230 kV transmission line as well. If it is determined that the 230 kV will be overhead, it will be installed on new utility poles with efforts made to negotiate with Hydro One to accommodate existing transmission on these poles.</li> </ul>
How will tree removal be addressed along the transmission line?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The transmission line will be designed to minimize impact on existing trees and wooded areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on current plans there is not expected to be any impact on significant forest features. It is however, possible that some individual trees may need to be trimmed or cut.</li> </ul>
How will the wind farm affect local airstrips?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The relevant portion of the transmission line will modified to maintain safe operation of the local airstrip.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impact is expected with the plans prepared.</li> </ul>

**Table 5.5: Summary of Key and Frequent Comments from Public and Consideration by Project Team**

Key and Frequent Comments	Project Response	How Comments were considered by Project Team
<b>Operation and Decommissioning</b>		
<p>How are turbines selected and placed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Turbine models are generally selected based on generating capacity, physical characteristics, and sound profile.</li> <li>• Turbine siting was based on:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Wind resource;</li> <li>○ Proximity to main power distribution system lines;</li> <li>○ Avoidance of interference with telecommunications network infrastructure;</li> <li>○ Local topography and access constraints; and,</li> <li>○ Coordination with landowners to reduce impact on farming operations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Regulated setbacks from:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ noise receptors (550 m / 40 dBA);</li> <li>○ significant natural environment features;</li> <li>○ property lines;</li> <li>○ public road right-of-ways; and,</li> <li>○ rail right-of-ways.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Turbine model and siting selection was chosen based on the noted criteria in accordance with local characteristics of the Project Location. These considerations are outlined for clarity in the Design and Operations Report.</li> </ul>
<p>What will happen to field drainage patterns?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are two scenarios that were reviewed for impacts to drainage:                             <p><i>During Construction</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Access roads will be constructed in a manner to allow surface drainage to flow across roads and maintain existing drainage patterns.</li> <li>○ Tile drainage modifications on agricultural land will be made at the start of construction by a licensed drainage contractor.</li> <li>○ Tile drainage modifications will be designed and constructed in a manner that allows for proper agricultural drainage during construction and operation of the facility.</li> </ul> <p><i>During Operation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Upon completion of turbine construction, temporary work areas along the access roads and at the turbine installation areas will be restored for agricultural use.</li> <li>○ Tile drainage will be reinstated in temporary construction areas.</li> <li>○ Soil compaction will also be remediated to mitigate impacts on</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction methods were developed to minimize impacts on field drainage patterns and agricultural land use. These methods are described in detail in the Construction Plan Report.</li> </ul>

**Table 5.5: Summary of Key and Frequent Comments from Public and Consideration by Project Team**

Key and Frequent Comments	Project Response	How Comments were considered by Project Team
<p>Who is responsible for decommissioning?</p>	<p>agricultural land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If operations are discontinued at any point, the Project will be decommissioned. Northland is responsible for decommissioning and related costs.</li> <li>• Decommissioning generally involves the following steps:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identify and sell infrastructure in-place that can be used for future use (e.g. transmission line, selected access roads).</li> <li>○ Remove all unused infrastructure using reverse engineering.</li> <li>○ Salvage or dispose of infrastructure at approved facilities.</li> <li>○ Restore lands to original use where applicable.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• For the removal of turbines, access roads will need to be re-constructed in a similar manner as required during construction to facilitate transportation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decommissioning procedures were carefully considered and described in the Decommissioning Plan Report.</li> </ul>
<p>What is the Project schedule?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction is scheduled to begin in Fall 2013 and be completed in Fall 2014.</li> <li>• The Project is scheduled to be in operation for at least 20 years from 2014 – 2034. After 20 years of operation, the Project may:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Continue operation with the same equipment.</li> <li>○ Continue operation with new equipment.</li> <li>○ Discontinue operation and remove equipment (decommissioning).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A detailed Project schedule has been included in the Construction Plan Report, and has been communicated with stakeholders at public meetings.</li> </ul>

### **5.5.2 Interest Groups and Non-Governmental Organizations**

The Project Team also communicated with various groups and organizations who were identified as possibly having an interest in the Project. This included groups that had an interest in the Project, and those contacted by the Project Team as potentially having information that could be considered in the various Project studies.

Owners of local infrastructure were also consulted during the REA Process, and include oil and gas companies operating an oil or natural gas pipeline and utility companies.

A summary of the key comments and feedback received from interest groups and NGOs are provided in **Table 5.6**, along with a description of how comments were considered by the Project Team including how:

- the Project design or study was altered in response to comments received;
- the REA Reports were amended based on comments received; and/or
- additional information was provided.

Summaries of key correspondence, comments received, and how the Project Team responded to each comment are provided in **Appendix E5**.

**Table 5.6: Consideration of Key Comments from Interest Groups and Non-Governmental Organizations**

Group	Comment	How Comments Were Considered by Project Team
Trans-Northern Pipelines Inc. (TNPI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicated that they have no facilities within the Project Study Area.</li> <li>• Requested to be removed from the Project contact list.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information noted by the Project Team.</li> <li>• The Project Team updated the Project distribution list based on feedback from TNPI.</li> </ul>
Goderich-Exeter Railway c/o Rail America	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Northland must complete a Utility Occupancy Licence (Wire) application form as the Project transmission line crosses the Goderich-Exeter rail line.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail America approval would be obtained outside of the REA process.</li> </ul>
Avon Maitland District School Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that the School Board does not hold any position on the Project nor do they have any policies/guidelines that would affect implementation of the Project.</li> <li>• Indicated that the following four schools are located in relative proximity to the transmission lines; however all locations fall outside of the Study Area boundary:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Exeter Public School;</li> <li>○ Hensall Public School;</li> <li>○ Stephen Central Public School; and,</li> <li>○ Zurich Public School.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Noted that no impact to their properties, buildings or occupants is anticipated once due diligence with respect to public safety and all policies/guidelines are followed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information noted by the Project Team.</li> </ul>
Bluewater Shoreline Residents Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that Bluewater residents oppose the Project due to ill health, property devaluation of high end real estate along the shoreline and threats to the migration paths of birds and the destruction of monarch butterflies.</li> <li>• Suggested a minimum of 3 mile setbacks from Highway 21 all along the shoreline to protect natural habitat and migration paths for wildlife.</li> <li>• Would like the Project to guarantee their real estate values before Project levels with a bond to hedge against losses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Project Team reviewed available literature on health effects and wind turbines and indicated that there is no direct link between wind turbines and health effects in humans. Reference was made to multiple health studies conducted to support this statement (1. Report released in December 2009 by an expert panel established by CanWEA, and the American Wind Energy Association (AWEA), and 2. independent reviews conducted by The Ontario Chief Medical officer of Health and the National Public Health Institute in Quebec).</li> <li>• The Project Team reviewed available</li> </ul>

**Table 5.6: Consideration of Key Comments from Interest Groups and Non-Governmental Organizations**

Group	Comment	How Comments Were Considered by Project Team
		<p>literature on property value effects and concluded that there is no evidence that property values decreased as a result of wind farms for any land property classes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project Team is working closely with the Ministry of Natural Resources, and Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority to ensure minimal impacts to the natural environment and with Environment Canada's Canadian Wildlife Services to address any federally designated species.</li> </ul>
<p>Bluewater Heritage Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that "60 days" was not sufficient for the Bluewater Heritage Committee to review the REA Reports. At least 6-10 months is required.</li> <li>Expressed concern with the impact of wind turbines on tourism. Feels that people will still come to the area but will spend less money and the Project would change the economic balance of the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained the timelines within the REA process. The Project Team scheduled meetings with the Municipality of Bluewater to keep them up to date on the Project.</li> <li>The Project Team reviewed available literature on the impact of wind turbines on tourism and concluded that there is no evidence to suggest significant adverse effects on tourism. Reference was made to case studies to support this statement (1. <i>CanWEA Community Benefits Fact Sheet</i>, 2. <i>Island Wind Energy, Securing our Future: the 10 Point Plan; October 2008</i>, and 3. <i>The economic impacts of wind farms on Scottish Tourism; March 2008</i>).</li> </ul>
<p>Bluewater Heritage Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested a site-specific study be undertaken with respect to the economic impact of the Project on tourism.</li> <li>Interested in coordinating such study.</li> <li>Requested to meet with Northland and the Project Team to discuss the potential of such a study. Noted that the entire area would need to be studied in order to obtain context.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project Team discussed with correspondent the potential for bias and concluded that if such a study were to move forward a number of proponents (i.e., private sector developers, county, municipalities, tourist board, tourism Ontario, etc.) would need to participate. No further action was taken by the Committee on this issue.</li> </ul>

**Table 5.6: Consideration of Key Comments from Interest Groups and Non-Governmental Organizations**

Group	Comment	How Comments Were Considered by Project Team
Bluewater Heritage Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inquired about the Land Lease Agreements and payments. Believes that wind energy projects are splitting communities.</li> <li>Inquired if a licensed archaeological and heritage consultant have been retained for the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explained that Land Lease Agreements are considered to be proprietary information.</li> <li>Confirmed that a licensed Archaeological and Heritage Consultant have been retained for this Project.</li> </ul>
Kingsmere Syndicate Cottagers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated that some of the turbines will be located within 0.75 km of their backyards.</li> <li>Asked if the Project has reached the stage where it is immune from municipal review or control.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided a figure that shows the closest turbines to Kingsmere Drive. Noted that T-45 is located approximately 1,000 m from the Kingsmere Cottage Community at its closest point.</li> <li>Stated the Municipality of South Huron may be able to provide their opinion on the municipal review/control within this process.</li> <li>The Project Team indicated that it is committed to working closely with the Municipality as the Project progresses.</li> </ul>
Kingsmere Syndicate Cottagers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested the current status of the Project with regard to the approvals process</li> <li>Indicated that there is opposition building in the Grand Bend business community regarding property devaluation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided a diagram that summarizes the REA process that the Project will have to follow.</li> <li>Explained the REA process and indicated what stage the Project is in.</li> <li>Provided a tentative Project schedule.</li> <li>The Project Team reviewed available literature on property value effects and concluded that there is no evidence that property values decreased as a result of wind farms for any land property classes.</li> </ul>
Zurich and District Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that the Project has a boundary that is close to Zurich and the home, business and institutional development that extends beyond the Ward of Zurich.</li> <li>Indicated that the Zurich Chamber of Commerce developed a boundary around the Zurich community as a result of the Project's boundary on their communities' ability to accept future growth and reduced property values that</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed that there are two turbines (T-19 and T-20) located at the edge of the boundary in the southwestern corner. Noted that there is also a storage building and sub-station in this area.</li> <li>The Project Team is working with the</li> </ul>



**Table 5.6: Consideration of Key Comments from Interest Groups and Non-Governmental Organizations**

Group	Comment	How Comments Were Considered by Project Team
	<p>result from a wind turbine project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advised that the area within the boundary proposed is to contain no area of a proposed wind turbine project or transmission line corridor.</li> <li>Noted that on December 5, 2011 the Bluewater Municipal Council voted unanimously in favour of the boundary around Zurich.</li> <li>Provided a grid map overlaid on Figure 1 of the Grand Bend Wind Farm Project. Noted that the area within the grid is all within the boundary that the Chamber requires surround Zurich.</li> <li>Requested removal of all of the Grand Bend Wind Project including the transmission line that encroaches upon the area proposed.</li> </ul>	<p>County of Huron to identify alternative suitable locations within the existing urban area for the storage building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anticipated negligible effects on this area to accept future growth as infrastructure within the area is limited and the transmission line is confined to the existing ROW.</li> <li>Indicated that there are no plans to remove any infrastructure at this time.</li> </ul>
Zurich and District Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asked if turbine T-03 is located outside of the area proposed by the Chamber.</li> <li>Clarified that the Chamber of Commerce concern does not apply to wind turbines only but also to infrastructure within the area where protection is being sought and this includes transmission lines and sub-stations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided a figure that shows the preliminary turbine layout overlay on the boundary provided by the Chamber. Indicated that turbine T-03 is outside of the boundary.</li> <li>Explained that an error was made and T-19 is not located within the boundary.</li> </ul>
McLeod Wood Associates Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested a meeting with correspondent, Walpole Island First Nation, Aamjiwnaang First Nation and Kettle and Stony Point First Nation to discuss the Project proposal and potential partnership business opportunities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project Team agreed to meetings with the correspondent, Walpole Island, Aamjiwnaang and Kettle and Stony Point First Nations communities.</li> </ul>

**5.6 CHANGES TO REA REPORTS**

**5.6.1 Post-Public Review – Presented at the Final Public Meeting**

Following the release of the Draft REA Reports for public review in September 2012, changes were made to the Project and REA Reports; these changes were presented at the final Public Meetings held in November and December 2012, as described in **Section 4.3.3**. A summary of the non-editorial and consistency changes made to the Draft REA reports, and the reason for the changes, are provided in **Table 5.7**. A presentation board at the final public meetings titled “We’re Listening” presented some of the key changes to the Project as a result of public comments and various REA studies.

**Table 5.7: Summary of REA Report Amendments**

<b>Amendment</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Final REA Report Reference</b>
<b>Project Update Report</b>		
Turbine T-21 Relocation	Turbine T-21 was relocated 60 m towards north-northeast to satisfy a recommendation made in the telecommunications study.	All relevant REA report figures and tables (i.e. Project Description Report Appendix A and C; Design and Operations Report Appendix A and D; The 2012 Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment of Minor Modifications to the Proposed Grand Bend Wind Farm, Figure 7; Environmental Impact Study, Appendix A).
Switchyard Location Confirmation	The Draft REA reports did not specify the precise location of the switchyard on private land. The Project Update Report identified the confirmed location.	All relevant REA report figures and descriptions (i.e. Project Description Report Appendix A; Design and Operations Report Appendix A and section 3.2.7; Construction Plan Report Appendix A and section 2.3.11; The 2012 Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment of Minor Modifications to the Proposed Grand Bend Wind Farm, Figure 11; Environmental Impact Study, Appendix A).
Construction Compound Area	Further detailed review of construction operations identified the need for a Construction Compound Area.	All relevant REA report figures and descriptions (i.e. Project Description Report Appendix A; Design and Operations Report Appendix A; Construction Plan Report Appendix A and sections 2.3.2, 2.3.13, 2.4.2; The 2012 Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment of Minor Modifications to the Proposed Grand Bend Wind Farm, Figure 8; Environmental Impact Study, Appendix A).

**Table 5.7: Summary of REA Report Amendments**

Amendment	Reason	Final REA Report Reference
<b>Other Information Presented at the Final Public Meetings</b>		
Noise Contour Plan	The noise contour plan was updated according to the relocation of Turbine T-21 noted above for presentation at the final public meeting.	Environmental Noise Impact Assessment – Noise Impact Summary Table and Figure 2.
Preferred Transmission Route Selected (Along Sararas Road, Rodgerville Road, and Road 183)	Upon the results of REA studies and consultation, the alternative transmission line route along Dashwood Road, Thames Road, and Highway 23 was not selected due to the greater potential for negative impacts on the environment, number of residents affected, and the increased length of the transmission line that would need to be constructed. Further details are described in the Project Description Report. This decision was clearly presented at the final public meetings.	All relevant REA report descriptions (i.e. Project Description Report, Section 2.2; Site Investigation Report, Section 1.1).
Consideration of 230 kV Transmission Line to be Installed Underground	Based on feedback from consultation, Northland is assessing the feasibility of installing the 230 kV transmission line underground.	All relevant REA report descriptions (i.e. Design and Operations Report, Section 3.2.6; Construction Plan Report, Section 2.3.8; Environmental Impact Study, Section 4.1).
Consideration of Alternate Location for Parts and Storage Building	Alternative locations for the Parts and Storage building are being explored to make use of existing commercial land in the community.	All relevant REA report descriptions (i.e. Project Description Report, Section 3.1.3, Design and Operations Report, Section 3.1.5).

**5.6.2 Post-Final Public Meeting**

The draft REA reports were amended after the final Public Meeting, prior to submission of the REA application. Amendments reflect the current state of Project planning, response to comments from the consultation process, and corrections to editorial errors. A summary of the non-editorial amendments made to the draft REA reports, and the reason for the amendment, is provided in **Table 5.8**.

**Table 5.8: Summary of REA Report Amendments**

Amendment	Reason	REA Report Reference
<b>Project Description Report</b>		
Addition of Emergency Backup Generators	Further detailed review of the operations of the facility indicated emergency backup generators will be required at the transformer substation and switchyard. They will operate under the conditions specified in O. Reg. 359/09, s.7(1).	Project Description Report, Section 2.3.
Updated Summary of Other Project Approvals	Table 2.3 was updated based on the current status of additional approvals required in addition to Renewable Energy Approval.	Project Description Report, Section 2.5, Table 2.3.
Updated Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan	Tables 4.1 – 4.4 were updated based on the MNR-approved Natural Heritage Assessment Environmental Impact Study Report.	Project Description Report, Section 4.0, Tables 4.1 – 4.4.

**Table 5.8: Summary of REA Report Amendments**

<b>Amendment</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>REA Report Reference</b>
<b>Design and Operations Report</b>		
Addition of Cultural and Archaeological Heritage Statements	In order to satisfy the requirements of the amended O. Reg. 359/09 on July 1, 2012, statements regarding cultural and archaeological heritage were added to Appendix F of the Design and Operations Report.	Design and Operations Report, Section 2.4 and Appendix F.
Additional Detail Added Regarding Transformer Substation Secondary Spill Containment	In order to satisfy the requirements of the amended O. Reg. 359/09 on July 1, 2012, additional details were added regarding mitigation measures for the transformer substation secondary spill containment system.	Design and Operations Report, Sections 3.2.5 and 4.4.
Updated Transformer Substation Layout	In consideration of an underground 230 kV transmission line as a response to public and municipal consultation (see Table 5.7 above), IESO has indicated that a shunt reactor might be required to be included at the substation. The resulting transformer substation layout was updated to accommodate this equipment in the case that it may be required. The revised substation layout is in the same location as previously defined, and remains within an area previously defined as a construction area (i.e. natural heritage, archaeological and other studies have been completed for the revised layout area).	Design and Operations Report, Section 3.2.5 and Appendix A.
Addition of Emergency Backup Generators	Further detailed review of the operations of the facility indicated emergency backup generators will be required at the transformer substation and switchyard. They will operate under the conditions specified in O. Reg. 359/09, s.7(1).	Design and Operations Report, Sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.7.
Further Detail Added on Radar Technology for Lighting Control	Further information was added describing the radar technology that is being considered to operate turbine lighting only when aircrafts are nearby.	Design and Operations Report, Section 4.1.5 and Section 5.4, Table 5.9.
Updated Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan	Tables 5.4 – 5.7 were updated based on the MNR-approved Natural Heritage Assessment Environmental Impact Study Report.	Design and Operations Report, Section 5.4, Tables 5.4 – 5.7.
Updated Emergency and Complaint Response Protocols	As requested by South Huron in their Municipal Consultation Form, the emergency response plan and complaint response protocols were updated with additional details.	Design and Operations Report, Sections 6.1 and 6.3.
Updated Noise Receptor and Turbine Location Tables	The noise receptor and turbine coordinate tables in Appendix D were updated to reflect the updated location of Turbine T-21 (see Table 5.7 above), and correct mismatched noise receptor IDs in the Draft Design and Operations Report.	Design and Operations Report, Appendix D.
<b>Construction Plan Report</b>		
Addition of Isolated or Dry Open-cut Watercourse Crossing Details	Details added regarding Isolated or Dry Open-cut Watercourse Crossings to be consistent with the Draft Water Assessment and Water Body Report.	Construction Plan Report, Section 2.3.6.
Added Reference to Complaint Response Protocol During Construction	As requested by South Huron in their Municipal Consultation Form, reference was made in the Construction Plan Report to the complaint response protocol outlined in the Design and Operations Report.	Construction Plan Report, Section 3.2.

**Table 5.8: Summary of REA Report Amendments**

<b>Amendment</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>REA Report Reference</b>
Updated Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan	Tables 3.4 – 3.7 were updated based on the MNR-approved Natural Heritage Assessment Environmental Impact Study Report.	Construction Plan Report, Section 3.4, Tables 3.4 – 3.7.
<b>Environmental Noise Impact Assessment</b>		
Updated Noise Receptor Data	The noise receptor data were updated to reflect the updated location of Turbine T-21 (see Table 5.7 above), and correct mismatched noise receptor IDs in the Draft Environmental Noise Impact Assessment.	Environmental Noise Impact Assessment, Noise Impact Summary Table and Figure 2.
Revised Acoustic Barrier Details	In consideration of an underground 230 kV transmission line as a response to public and municipal consultation (see Table 5.7 above), IESO has indicated that a shunt reactor might be required to be included at the substation. The resulting transformer substation and acoustic barrier layout was updated to accommodate this equipment in the case that it may be required.	Environmental Noise Impact Assessment, Noise Impact Summary Table and Figure 3.
<b>The 2012 Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment of Minor Modifications to the Proposed Grand Bend Wind Farm</b>		
Additional Archaeological Studies for the Revised Project Features Presented in Table 5.7 Above	Additional archaeological studies were performed as indicated in the Project Update Report referenced above in Table 5.7.	The 2012 Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment of Minor Modifications to the Proposed Grand Bend Wind Farm.
<b>The 2012 Heritage Assessment of the Proposed Grand Bend Wind Farm</b>		
Additional heritage Studies for the Revised Project Features Presented in Table 5.7 Above	Additional heritage studies were performed as indicated in the Project Update Report referenced above in Table 5.7.	The 2012 Heritage Assessment of the Proposed Grand Bend Wind Farm.
<b>Natural Heritage Assessment – Site Investigation</b>		
Removal of Amphibian Corridors as a possible habitat type present in the Study Area	This habitat was further assessed based on the EcoRegion Wildlife Criteria Schedules and additional consultation with the MNR. It was determined that candidate habitat is not present.	Site Investigation, Section 7.4.5.
Addition of Amphibian Breeding Habitat (Wetland) as a possible type of habitat present in the Study Area.	This habitat was further assessed based on the EcoRegion Wildlife Criteria Schedules and additional consultation with the MNR. It was determined that candidate habitat is present in a small pond along the transmission line route. This feature was identified as Generalized Candidate Significant Wildlife Habitat.	Site Investigation, Section 7.4.3.
Re-evaluation of Candidate Bat Maternity Colonies in the winter of 2013	Through consultation with the MNR and new guidance and training that was made available after the initial studies, it was determined that candidate habitats should be re-assessed in the winter of 2013.	Site Investigation, Section 7.4.1, Evaluation of Significance, Section 5.4.1 and Environmental Impact Study, Appendix B.
Identification of Wetland Complexes	In order to more accurately describe the connectivity between several wetlands in the Study Area, three Wetland Complexes were identified (Complexes A, B and C).	Site Investigation, Section 7.2.
Identification of Additional candidate habitats for Special Concern and	Through consultation with the MNR, four additional candidate habitats were identified, bringing the total number of candidate habitats to 17.	Site Investigation, Section 7.4.4.

**Table 5.8: Summary of REA Report Amendments**

<b>Amendment</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>REA Report Reference</b>
Rare Species		
<b>Natural Heritage Assessment- Evaluation of Significance</b>		
Re-Evaluation of Significant Woodlands	Woodlands were re-assessed based on the criteria provided in the Natural Heritage Assessment Guide for Renewable Energy Projects (MNR, 2011). This resulted in the removal of W-041 and W-067 as significant features and the addition of W-103 and W-120 as significant woodlands.	Evaluation of Significance, Section 5.3.
<b>Natural Heritage Assessment- Environmental Impact Study</b>		
Removal of Significant Valleylands as a type of natural feature	Amendments to O. Reg. 359/09 removed valleylands as a type of natural feature requiring assessment in the Natural Heritage Assessment. Valleylands to be permitted in conjunction with Conservation Authority permits.	Environmental Impact Study, Section 2.0.
Updated mitigation measures for Generalized Features, Significant Features and Features Treated as Significant	Tables 5.2 and 5.4 updated based on comments from the MNR.	Environmental Impact Study, Sections 5.1 and 5.2.
Addition of more detailed Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan	Based on MNR comments, Table 7.1 added to clarify potential operational effects and post-construction monitoring plans.	Environmental Impact Study, Section 7.0.
Addition of further details related to pre-and post-construction monitoring plans	Details provided in Appendices B,C,D and E added, in accordance with comments received from the MNR.	Appendices B,C,D and E.
Addition of Smaller Scale Mapping	Mapping provided at a smaller scale so construction work areas can more clearly been seen.	Appendix A.
<b>Natural Heritage Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan</b>		
Updated Natural Heritage Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan	Report updated based on a new report template provided by the MNR.	Entire Report.
Addition of Post-construction Monitoring Details for Significant Natural Features	Report updated to include a summary of the monitoring plan for all significant natural features as well as the bird and bat monitoring program.	Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan, Section 2.0.
<b>Impact Study – Identification of Telecommunication Systems</b>		
Turbine T-21 Relocation	Updated telecommunications analysis according to Turbine T-21 relocation identified in Project Update Report (see Table 5.7 above).	Impact Study – Identification of Telecommunication Systems.
Consultation With Environment Canada	Updated report according to further consultation with Environment Canada.	Impact Study – Identification of Telecommunication Systems.

## **6.0 Agency and Municipal Consultation**

---

The following sections describe communication with federal, provincial and other agencies throughout the REA process.

### **6.1 AGENCY PROJECT NOTIFICATION AND GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Formal communications began on October 24, 2011 when a letter was sent to various federal, provincial and other agencies such as Environment Canada's Canadian Wildlife Service, local municipal staff, and Conservation Authorities with a request for natural features, species at risk, wildlife and aquatic habitat, geological information and environmental inventory of the Project Study Area, in order to prepare the Natural Heritage Assessment Records Review Report as per section 25 of O. Reg. 359/09.

On January 30, 2012, a Draft Project Description Report (PDR) was sent to the Director of the Environmental Approvals Access & Service Integration Branch at the Ministry of the Environment (MOE).

The Notice of a Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project was distributed to agencies and organizations that may have a potential interest in the Project on February 27, 2012. The Notice of Draft Site Plan was distributed on April 17, 19 and 20, 2012.

On September 24, 2012, agencies received the Notice of Final Public Meeting. The Notice provided details regarding the public locations where the Draft REA Reports could be viewed 60 days prior to the Public Meeting including a link to the Project website (see **Section 4.3.3**).

On October 22, 2012 all agencies on the Project distribution list were provided with the Notice of Draft Site Plan Extension (see **Section 4.3.4**). The Notice provided an update on the Project layout and details regarding the public locations where the Project Update Report and the MOE Director's Letter of Extension could be viewed.

In addition to the Project notifications mentioned above, in accordance with section 18 (3) of O. Reg. 359/09, copies of the reports to be submitted as part of the REA application for the Project (with the exception of the Consultation Report and the Letters from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport and the Ministry of Natural Resources in respect of the Project Location) were distributed in draft format to the following agencies on August 27, 2012, at least 90 days prior to the Final Public Meeting:

- Ministry of the Environment;
- Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport;



- Ministry of Energy; and,
- Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority.

On September 26, 2012 the agencies listed above were provided with a Project Update Report, an addendum to the Draft REA Reports distributed on August 27, 2012. The Report provided changes to the Project, including a modified turbine location, a confirmed location for the switchyard and the addition of a construction compound area. A copy of the Project Update Report is provided in **Appendix F6**.

Additional contact with agencies occurred throughout the course of Project planning. This contact included e-mails, letters, telephone correspondence and visits to agency offices to gather and/or clarify information collected for the technical studies.

## **6.2 FEDERAL AGENCY AND ORGANIZATION CONSULTATION**

### **6.2.1 Federal Agency Distribution List**

Numerous federal departments and authorities included on the Project distribution list and therefore notified and kept updated regarding the Project:

- Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency;
- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation;
- Canadian Transportation Agency;
- Department of National Defence;
- Environment Canada;
- Fisheries and Oceans Canada;
- Health Canada;
- Infrastructure Canada;
- NAV Canada;
- Natural Resources Canada;
- Parks Canada;
- Radio Advisory Board of Canada;
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police; and,
- Transport Canada.



## **6.2.2 Summary of Key Correspondence and Consideration of Key Comments**

### **Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency**

The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA) identified several federal authorities that may have an interest in the Project. Federal agencies that were not previously identified on the CEAA list were contacted, as of March 23, 2012. Some of these agencies had either not responded or replied that they would engage in the Project.

### **Environment Canada**

Environment Canada's (EC's) Canadian Wildlife Services provided comments in response to a request from the Project Team for information related to natural features and wildlife species in the Project Study Area in January 2012.

### **Transport Canada**

Transport Canada contacted the Project Team in July 2012 to clarify their interest in the Project, which are related to navigable waters and turbine lighting and marking requirements. Northland has acknowledged that an Aeronautical Obstruction Clearance Form must be submitted to Transport Canada (Aerodromes and Air Navigation Services Division) and that an application under the *Navigable Waters Protection Act* is required if the Project will construct or place works within a navigable waterway.

## **6.2.3 Consideration of Key Comments**

A summary of the key comments from federal agencies and organizations are provided in **Table 6.1** along with a description of how comments were considered by the Project Team including how:

- the Project or study design was alerted in response to comments received;
- the REA Reports were amended based on comments received; and/or,
- additional information was provided.

Details regarding the key federal agency and organization comments, and how the Project Team considered each comment, are provided in **Appendix F2**.

**Table 6.1: Key Comments from Federal Agencies and Organizations, and Consideration by Project Team**

Agency	Comment	Response	How Comments Were Considered by Project Team
Natural Resources Canada (NRCan)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated that the Office of Energy Efficiency has no responsibilities for these types of renewable energy projects.</li> <li>Noted that they forwarded the Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) to the Energy Sector where a response would be prepared regarding the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged.</li> <li>The Project Team updated the Project distribution list based on feedback from NRCan. No response has been received from the Energy Sector to date.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project Team amended the consultation program to contact the Energy Sector about the Project, based on feedback from NRCan.</li> </ul>
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided a list of federal authorities that may have an interest in the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Federal agencies that were not previously identified on the CEAA list were contacted, as of March 23, 2012. Some of these agencies had either not responded or replied that they would engage in the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Project Team amended the consultation program to contact federal authorities not previously identified, regarding the Project, based on feedback from the CEAA.</li> </ul>
Environment Canada's (EC's) Canadian Wildlife Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested that the Project Team refer to the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (OMNR) Natural Heritage Information Centre (NHIC), local district OMNR office closest to the Project Area, the Ontario Breeding Bird Atlas (OBBA), and the Species At Risk Public Registry for information on natural features and wildlife species.</li> <li>Noted that overtime critical habitat will be identified for all federally-listed endangered or threatened species and therefore it will be important to be aware of Species At Risk when planning wind energy projects.</li> <li>Provided a brief summary of agencies that have formally identified critical habitat in final and proposed federal recovery documents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The information sources provided by EC's Canadian Wildlife Service were considered in the preparation of the Natural Heritage Assessment Records Review Report.</li> </ul>
Transport Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An application under the <i>Navigable Waters Protection Act</i> is required if the Project will construct or place works within a navigable waterway.</li> <li>Northland must complete an Aeronautical Obstruction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<p>Transport Canada approvals will be obtained outside of the REA process.</p>

**Table 6.1: Key Comments from Federal Agencies and Organizations, and Consideration by Project Team**

Agency	Comment	Response	How Comments Were Considered by Project Team
	Clearance Form for lighting and marking requirements.		

**6.3 PROVINCIAL AGENCY AND ORGANIZATION CONSULTATION**

**6.3.1 Provincial Agency and Authority Distribution List**

Numerous provincial agencies and authorities were included on the Project distribution list and were therefore notified and kept updated regarding the Project:

- Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority;
- Electrical Safety Authority;
- Hydro One Networks Inc.;
- Infrastructure Ontario;
- Independent Electricity System Operator;
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing;
- Ministry of Energy ;
- Ministry of Environment;
- Ministry of Natural Resources;
- Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs;
- Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport ;
- Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure;
- Ministry of Northern Development, Mines and Forestry;
- Ministry of Transportation;
- Ontario Power Generation;
- Ontario Energy Board;
- Ontario Provincial Police; and,
- Technical Standards and Safety Authority.

### **6.3.2 Summary of Key Correspondence and Consideration of Key Comments**

#### **Ministry of the Environment**

The Project Team maintained regular communication with the Ministry of Environment (MOE) throughout the REA process. The Draft Project Description Report (PDR) was sent to the Director on January 30, 2012 along with the request for the MOE Aboriginal Communities List for the Project. The MOE issued the Aboriginal Communities List for the Project on March 20, 2012.

On March 21, 2012, members of the Project Team and Northland representatives met with MOE staff to discuss the Project, confirm REA application requirements and identify or address other potential concerns.

The Project Team also had several communications with the MOE throughout the REA process to clarify REA reporting and approval requirements related to various topics, including: approaches to the investigations required for the REA, extension of time to submit a REA application, requirements for engaging Aboriginal communities, and consultation activities.

The MOE was sent all Notices and Draft REA Reports including a Project Update Report for the Project.

#### **Ministry of Natural Resources**

The Project Team maintained regular communication with the Ministry of Natural (MNR) throughout the REA process. **Table 6.2** below provides a summary of the Natural Heritage Assessment (NHA) Reports and Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan (EEMP) submissions to the MNR, as of March 14, 2012. Key correspondence relevant to the REA process was generally related to the Natural Heritage Assessment and Environmental Impact Study (NHA/EIS). This included various discussions regarding clarification of MNR expectations and requirements for preparation of the NHA/EIS.

**GRAND BEND WIND FARM  
CONSULTATION REPORT**  
Agency and Municipal Consultation  
February 2013

**Table 6.2: Summary of NHA Submissions and MNR Responses**

<b>Report</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Report Submission</b>	<b>MNR Response</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Submission</b>	<b>MNR Response</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Submission</b>	<b>MNR Response</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Submission</b>	<b>MNR Response</b>	<b>Final Submission</b>	<b>Final Sign-off by MNR</b>
<b>Records Review (RR)</b>	March 14, 2012	April 4, 2012	May 30, 2012	June 2, 2012	June 7, 2012	June 14, 2012				
<b>Site Investigation (SI)</b>	March 26, 2012	July 6, 2012	August 17, 2012	August 23, 2013	September 27, 2012	October 16, 2012	October 26, 2012	November 2, 2012		
<b>Evaluation of Significance (EOS)</b>	March 26, 2012	July 6, 2012	August 17, 2012	August 24, 2012	November 7, 2012	November 19, 2012	November 21, 2012	November 22, 2012		
<b>EIS</b>	August 17, 2012	September 4, 2012	November 30, 2012	December 14, 2012	January 2, 2013	January 3, 2013 and January 9, 2013	January 15, 2013	January 18, 2013		
<b>Final Compiled NHA (includes pdf version of all RR, SI, EOS and EIS)</b>									January 25, 2013	January 28, 2013
<b>Environmental Effects Monitoring Plan (EEMP)</b>	August 17, 2012	None	November 30, 2012	January 3, 2013	January 23, 2013	January 28, 2013				January 28, 2013

On August 25, 2011, Northland and Neegan Burnside representatives met with the MNR to:

- Review guidance documents to gain an understanding of the new REA process; and,
- Review Project details and discussed methodologies for environmental fieldwork.

Northland representatives and several Project Team members met with the MNR again on April 10, 2012 to provide an update on the status of the Project, fieldwork completed to date and the Project schedule. At the meeting, discussions were held regarding:

- The MNR's Draft Significant Wildlife Habitat Ecoregion 6 criterion;
- Approaches to investigations required for the Natural Heritage Assessment;
- MNR's expectation with respect to the Natural Heritage Assessment Reports;
- Information required for MNR's Approval and Permitting Requirements Document (APRD) for the Project;
- The Endangered Species Act (ESA), species at risk and their habitat at or near the Project Location;
- Identification of petroleum resources in the Project Location;
- Wildlife mortality; and,
- Crown Land issues related to watercourse crossings.

### **Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport**

The 2011-2012 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed Grand Bend Wind Farm, dated, August 14, 2012 was submitted by D.R. Poulton & Associates Inc. to the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) on August 16, 2012. On September 17, 2012, the MTCS provided D.R. Poulton & Associates Inc. and Neegan Burnside with a letter summarizing the recommendations in the report and stating that the MTCS is satisfied with these recommendations. On that same day, a separate letter from MTCS was issued to the archaeological consulting firm for the Project confirming that MTCS had accepted the report into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports. On December 17, 2012 an addendum report concerning minor changes to the Project was submitted to MTCS by D.R. Poulton & Associates Inc. On January 25, 2013 their letter indicating satisfaction with the addendum report was provided.

The 2012 Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Proposed Grand Bend Wind Farm, dated, August 16, 2012 was submitted to the MTCS on August 16, 2012. As a result of questions from the MTCS on October 11, 2012 a revised report was submitted December 7, 2012. On January 7, 2012, the MTCS provided D.R. Poulton & Associates Inc. and Neegan Burnside with a letter summarizing the recommendations in the report and stating that the MTCS is satisfied with these recommendations.

### **Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority**

Following initial Project communications with Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority (ABCA) regarding natural heritage (see **Section 6.1**), an introductory meeting was held on March 1, 2012, that was attended by representatives from Northland, Neegan Burnside and ABCA. Neegan Burnside presented background information about the Project, current status in the REA process and proposed timelines for submissions. ABCA clarified their role with respect to the REA process and described their Level 2 agreement with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO). Items discussed at the meeting:

- Type and level of detail of information required by ABCA for work in Regulated Areas; and,
- ABCA concerns regarding the Project layout area.

Northland and Neegan Burnside offered to meet with ABCA in the future and committed to providing an updated layout including preliminary culvert and road designs.

On June 4, 2012, a preliminary submission was made to ABCA to clarify design inputs and the proposed approach to watercourse crossing approvals. ABCA responded with comments on July 25, 2012, September 4, 2012, and November 21, 2012 to clarify permitting requirements..

Further details will be submitted for ABCA review in their floodplain-regulated areas. Approval for works within ABCA's jurisdiction will be obtained separately from REA.

#### **6.3.3 Consideration of Key Provincial Agency Comments**

A summary of the key comments from provincial agencies and organizations are provided in **Table 6.3** along with a description of how comments were considered by the Project Team including how:

- the Project or study design was alerted in response to comments received;
- the REA Reports were amended based on comments received; and/or,
- additional information was provided.

A detailed summary of each provincial agency comment, and how the Project Team considered each comment, are provided in **Appendix F3**.

**Table 6.3: Key Comments from Provincial Agencies and Consideration by Project Team**

Agency	Comment	Response	How Comments Were Considered by Project Team
Ministry of the Environment (MOE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided the Aboriginal Community List recommended for consultation</li> <li>• Provided guidance on various topics including REA report requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Project Team engaged all Aboriginal groups listed by the MOE and offered meetings.</li> <li>• The Project Team considered all comments and guidance received from the MOE, and intends to satisfy all requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Project Team amended the consultation program to include an additional Aboriginal Community not previously identified.</li> <li>• The Project Team took all guidance from the MOE into consideration during Project and study design and during preparation of the REA application.</li> </ul>
Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided comments on the Records Review, Site Investigation, Evaluation of Significance, Environmental Impact Study and Environmental Effects Monitoring (EEMP) Reports.</li> <li>• Confirmation letter for Natural Heritage Assessment/Environmental Impact Study received January 28, 2013.</li> <li>• Confirmation letter for EEMP received January 28, 2013.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Project Team considered and addressed all comments and feedback received from the MNR.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Project Team took all guidance from the MNR into consideration during Project and study design and during preparation of the REA application.</li> </ul>
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter of satisfaction for Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment received September 17, 2012.</li> <li>• Confirmation letter for Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment received September 17, 2012.</li> <li>• Confirmation letter for Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment of Minor Modifications received January 25, 2012.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minor changes to the site plans resulted in an addendum to the report submitted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All comments and feedback received from MTCS was considered in preparation and finalizing reports.</li> </ul>
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter of satisfaction for Cultural Heritage Assessment received January 7, 2012</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments provided on heritage study in October 2012. Addendum to report submitted to MTCS on December 7, 2012.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All comments and feedback received from MTCS was considered in preparation and finalizing reports.</li> </ul>
Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority (ABCA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided fishing records and information related to endangered and threatened species, Environmentally Sensitive Areas and significant valleylands in the Study Area.</li> <li>• Clarified permitting requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated Project mapping and data from ABCA was included in the Natural Heritage Assessment Records Review and Water Body Reports.</li> <li>• Further details will be submitted for ABCA review in their floodplain-regulated areas.</li> <li>• Approval for works within</li> </ul>



**Table 6.3: Key Comments from Provincial Agencies and Consideration by Project Team**

Agency	Comment	Response	How Comments Were Considered by Project Team
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ABCA's jurisdiction will be obtained separately from REA.</li> </ul>
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority (UTRCA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that the "North Option" Transmission Line would fall outside the watershed UTRCA. Further west of UTRCA watershed boundary, the larger portion of the Project will fall under the jurisdiction of ABCA.</li> <li>• Section 28 permits may be required where the "South Alternative Option" Transmission Line traverses through natural hazard and natural heritage areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Project Team considered the information provided by UTRCA. The "North Option" Transmission Line was selected as the preferred alternative route based on population density, environmental, and cost considerations.</li> </ul>
Ministry of Northern Development and Mines (MNDM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided information related to any known mines and mineral occurrences as well as mining claims in the Project area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data provided by MNDM was included in the REA reports.</li> </ul>
Ministry of Transportation (MTO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that the MTO controls all encroachments within the provincial highway right-of-way.</li> <li>• Indicated that an Encroachment Application is required for any installation or stockpile or other work upon, over or under, or within the limits of the provincial highway right-of-way.</li> <li>• Acknowledged that building and land use permits would not be required based on the layout provided in the Draft Site Plan.</li> <li>• Indicated entrance permits will be required for access from a provincial highway (i.e. Highway 21).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Project Team took into consideration the information provided by the MTO.</li> </ul>
Ministry of Energy REFO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that a local resident expressed concerns regarding turbine setbacks requirements and an access road to be constructed close to their home.</li> <li>• Inquired whether someone at Neegan Burnside or Northland has been assigned to address these concerns.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided REFO with copies of correspondence to confirm Project Team responses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
Infrastructure Ontario (IO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that there is a potential that IO managed lands fall within the Project Study Area and as a result, the proposal may impact IO managed properties and/or the activities of tenants present on IO-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Project Team considered the information provided by IO.</li> <li>• No IO lands are expected to be involved or impacted.</li> </ul>

**Table 6.3: Key Comments from Provincial Agencies and Consideration by Project Team**

Agency	Comment	Response	How Comments Were Considered by Project Team
	<p>managed lands.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requested the Proponent conduct a title search to determine the extent of ownership by MOI or its predecessors ownership.</li> <li>• Requested that IO be contacted if any ownership of provincial government lands are known to occur within the Study Area and are proposed to be impacted.</li> <li>• Indicated that renewable energy projects are exempted from the IO, MOI EA process.</li> <li>• Noted that once a REA is granted, projects that impact IO managed lands will require an “Application of Client Ministry of Agency’s Class EA or Declaration Order” form to be completed. All documentation, backup information, approvals and any required permits, associated with the Green Energy Act EA approval is to be provided to IO, prior to construction, on proposed lands, managed by IO.</li> </ul>		
<p>Hydro One Networks Inc. (HONI)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed that Hydro One Transmission facilities are located within immediate vicinity of the proposed site in the Study Area.</li> <li>• Suggested appropriate lead-time in the Project schedule in the event that the proposed development impacts Hydro One infrastructure which requires relocation or modifications, or needs an outage that may not be readily available.</li> <li>• Noted that construction activities must maintain the electrical clearance from the transmission line conductors as specified in the Ontario Health and Safety Act for the respective line voltage.</li> <li>• Requested that there be no disturbance of the earth around the poles, guy wires and tower footings. No grading, excavating, filling or other civil works close to the structure is allowed.</li> <li>• Requested plans that detail the Project development and the affected Hydro One facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All comments and feedback received from HONI were considered in Project planning.</li> </ul>

## **6.4 CONSULTATION REGARDING TELECOMMUNICATION AND RADAR SYSTEMS**

A consultation program was undertaken primarily by Yves R. Hamel et Associés Inc. (YHR) on behalf of Northland to verify the impact of the deployment of the Grand Bend Wind Farm Project on the telecommunication systems operating in the region of Huron County, Ontario. The study also aimed to identify radar and navigation systems with the potential to be affected by wind turbines and to assess the potential for impact on radio and television broadcast signals in the region.

The following system categories were included in the assessment:

- Broadcast systems, TV, FM radio and AM radio;
- Navigational aid systems, VOR;
- Mobile systems, VHF and UHF mobile, cellular and PCS;
- Point to Point radio systems, UHF, microwave and satellite links;
- Point to Multipoint systems, FWA, MMDS, LMCS;
- Navigational and meteorological radar systems;
- Canadian National Seismograph Network.

Registered providers of telecommunication and radar systems, including federal and provincial bodies were contacted, including:

- Government radar and communication systems, including the Department of National Defence, Environment Canada Weather Radars, Canadian Coast Guard, and NavCanada;
- Radio communication agencies, including Rogers Wireless Communications and TELUS Communications; and,
- Internet providers such as Xplornet Broadband.

In addition some field surveys were conducted to determine detailed locations of some key communication systems.

### **6.4.1 Summary of Key Comments**

A summary of the key comments from telecommunication and radar systems providers are provided in **Table 6.4**, along with a description of how comments were considered by the Project Team including how:

- the Project design or study was altered in response to comments received;
- the REA Reports were amended based on comments received; and/or
- additional information was provided.

Summaries of key correspondence, comments received, and how the Project Team considered each comment are provided in **Appendix F4**.

**Table 6.4: Key Comments from Telecommunication and Radar Systems Providers**

<b>Provider</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Project Response</b>	<b>How Comments Were Considered by Project Team</b>
Department of National Defence: Air Traffic Control and Air Defence Radars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No objection to first proposal.</li> <li>Project Team made a minor revision to DNDs Wind Turbine Submission Form detailing the wind turbine characteristics for the Project's 48 wind turbine generators.</li> <li>No objection to the second proposal.</li> <li>Requested to be informed if the Project is cancelled or delayed, altered or sold to another developer.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland to inform DND if the Project is cancelled or delayed, altered or sold to another developer.</li> </ul>
Department of National Defence: Radio Communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No objection.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
NAV Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No objection.</li> <li>Requested notification at least 10 business days prior to the start of construction to maintain up-to-date aeronautical publications and issue NOTAM as required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland to provide Notification Form at least 10 business days prior to the start of construction.</li> </ul>
Transport Canada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An Aeronautical Assessment Form must be submitted to Transport Canada for an assessment of lighting and marking requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport Canada approvals will be obtained outside of the REA process.</li> </ul>
Environment Canada (EC): Weather Radars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that the interference created by the Project will adversely impact the Exeter weather radar resulting in significant Doppler interference and Multi-path scattering reflections.</li> <li>Indicated that they look forward to any potential mitigation discussions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland is working with EC to identify mitigation measures to minimize any potential impact of the Project on EC's ability to forecast severe weather events in the area.</li> </ul>
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated that the Project does not create a problem</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>

**Table 6.4: Key Comments from Telecommunication and Radar Systems Providers**

<b>Provider</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Project Response</b>	<b>How Comments Were Considered by Project Team</b>
	for the RCMP.		
Canadian Coast Guard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that they do not anticipate any interference problems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
Ministry of Government Services: Infrastructure Technology Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicated that the Project will not affect the operations of Ontario's public safety mobile radio network.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>

**6.5 MUNICIPAL STAFF AND ELECTED OFFICIALS CONSULTATION**

The Project is located in Huron County, spanning the lower-tier municipalities of Bluewater and Huron South. Portions of the transmission line also traverse the municipality of Huron East and municipality of West Perth in Perth County. Under O. Reg. 359/09, the clerks of these upper and lower-tier municipalities are required to be contacted throughout the REA process with Project information, including the Municipal Consultation Package.

The Project is located within the riding of the Member of Parliament and Member of Provincial Parliament of Huron-Bruce.

**6.5.1 Notices and Municipal Consultation Form Distribution**

All mandatory notices issued for the Project were sent to the Clerks, including appropriate municipal staff of the Counties of Huron and Perth and the Municipalities of Bluewater, Huron South, Huron East and West Perth. In addition to Project notifications, in accordance with section 18 (2) of O. Reg. 359/09, the Draft Project Description Report (PDR) and the Municipal Consultation Form (MCF) were provided to the Clerks of these upper and lower-tier municipalities in February 2012, at least 30 days before Public Meeting #1.

In accordance with section 18 (3) of O. Reg. 359/09, at least 90 days prior to the Final Public Meeting, the Draft REA Reports (excluding the Consultation Report and Letters from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport and Ministry of Natural Resources with respect to the Project Location) were provided to the Clerks of the Municipalities of Bluewater, Huron South, Huron East and West Perth as well as Huron and Perth Counties on August 27, 2012.

On September 26, 2012, local municipal staff was provided with the Project Update Report. The Report reflected Project changes as of August 27, 2012 (see **Appendix F6**).

Summaries of key correspondence, comments from municipal staff, and how the Project Team considered each comment, are provided in **Appendix F5**. The municipal distribution list can be found in **Appendix B3**.

The Project Team corresponded regularly and had meetings and/or telephone contact on numerous occasions with municipal staff. The Project Team worked to ensure Project information was received and understood by municipal staff and that comments received were incorporated into the Project planning and design, to the greatest extent possible.

### **6.5.2 Overview of Consultation with Municipal Staff**

The Project Team including Northland regularly communicates with staff from the Counties of Huron and Perth and the Municipalities of Bluewater, Huron South, Huron East and West Perth and provides communication regarding the Project including the Project Notices, the MCF and Draft REA Reports (see **Section 6.5.1**). Summaries of key correspondence with each municipality are provided in **Appendix F5**. Initial contact with the County of Huron, and the Municipalities of South Huron and Bluewater began on October 24, 2011 regarding natural features, species at risk, wildlife and aquatic habitat, geological information and environmental inventory of the Project Study Area for preparation of the Natural Heritage Assessment Records Review Report in accordance with section 25 of O. Reg. 359/09 (see **Appendix F5**).

Northland and the Project Team held meetings with various representatives of both Counties and the local or lower-tier municipalities in February, March and December 2012 including representatives from their Planning and Public Works Departments, among others.

Introductory meetings were held with each municipality in February and March of 2012, as follows:

- Meeting #1 – February 13, 2012; Northland and Neegan Burnside met with Perth County and the Municipalities of West Perth, Huron East and South Huron staff.
- Meeting #2 – February 27, 2012; Northland and Neegan Burnside met with the County of Huron and South Huron staff.
- Meeting # 3 – March 2, 2012; Northland and Neegan Burnside met with the County of Huron staff.
- Meeting # 4 – March 15, 2012; Northland and Neegan Burnside met with the Municipality of Bluewater staff.

The purpose of the introductory meetings was to introduce the Project Team, and the Project proposal to the municipalities. At the meeting, Northland provided an overview of their Company and Neegan Burnside clarified their role with respect to the Project. Hard copies of the Draft Project Description Report were provided to municipal staff. Neegan Burnside provided a power point presentation. The slides provided an overview of the Project, presented key steps in the REA process, potential environmental and mitigation and identified next steps in the process. During the presentation, discussions were held regarding the transmission line, municipal drains, turbine lighting, Clear Zone and Road User Agreements.

General discussion at the four meetings related to:

- Easement acquisition from landowners for overhead power lines;
- Land Lease Agreements;
- Compensation for the use of road allowance;
- Stray voltage;
- Land use impact of vacant lands/lands that could have received a house;
- Aggregate sources for the Project;
- Culvert installations;
- The visual simulations;
- The telecommunication study;
- The Study Area boundary identified for the Project;
- Emergency response;
- The use of Ontario-made wind turbine components;
- Public perception of the Project;
- Post-construction noise monitoring;
- Decommissioning procedures;
- Impacts to municipal drains;
- Road rehabilitation;
- Turbine lighting;
- Possibility of sharing transmission lines with NextEra Energy Resources
- Desire to have all electrical transmission lines underground;
- Expansion of the Project in the near future; and,
- Northland's experience with other renewable energy projects.

Subsequent meetings were held in the latter part of 2012. Northland met with Bluewater staff on August 29, 2012. At the meeting, discussions were held regarding the MCF, Draft REA Reports, and a road user agreement for the Project. Northland provided an overview of the Project and additional details on the Project schedule.

On September 25, 2012, Northland and Neegan Burnside met with the County of Huron and the Municipalities of South Huron, Huron East and West Perth staff. Neegan Burnside provided a verbal presentation regarding the transmission and collector lines for the Project. Northland stated that they will meet with Hydro One in the future to discuss clearance requirements and joint use of utility poles. Northland committed to providing information on standard tests

performed for stray voltage and informed the municipalities that stray voltage will be addressed at the public meetings. Northland requested location options for the Parts and Storage Building. Items discussed at the meeting included:

- Project construction schedule;
- Project notifications;
- Turbine lighting; and,
- Compensation agreements.

Following the meeting, West Perth provided a letter on October 15, 2012 with follow-up questions arising from the meeting regarding transmission route selection, stray voltage and power quality concerns. A response letter to these issues was provided to West Perth on November 2, 2012.

A meeting was held with Neegan Burnside, Dietrich Engineering Ltd. and Bluewater staff on October 24, 2012, and with South Huron staff on that same day. Neegan Burnside presented at least two locations where municipal drain improvements would be required to facilitate construction of the Project. Discussions were held regarding approaches for obtaining drainage approvals.

Northland and Neegan Burnside met with the Bluewater staff again on December 4, 2012. Northland provided a status update on the Project, expected date for the submission of the REA application, anticipated construction and commercial operation dates, and environmental/technical studies that were underway. Neegan Burnside requested the MCF comments from Bluewater staff in order to incorporate the information and municipal requirements into the Project planning and REA Reports, where possible. Discussions were held regarding a road user agreement and entrance permits for the Project. Bluewater provided an overview of their residents' perception about the Project and Neegan Burnside stated how their concerns are being addressed.

A Municipal Consultation Form was completed by the Municipality of South Huron. A courtesy copy was sent to the Counties of Huron and Perth and the Municipalities of Bluewater, Huron East and West Perth as well as Ausable Bayfield Conservation Authority. The Form was provided to the Project Team on December 16, 2012, and the Project Team provided a response letter on January 18, 2013 to all parties mentioned above.

Northland is committed to continuing discussions with the municipalities following submission of the REA application to the MOE.



### **6.5.3 Consideration of Key Municipal Comments**

A summary of the key municipal comments is provided in **Table 6.5**, along with a description of how comments were considered by the Project Team including how.

- the Project design or study was altered in response to comments received;
- the REA Reports were amended based on comments received; and/or
- additional information was provided.

Summaries of key correspondence, comments from municipal staff, and how the Project Team considered each comment, are provided in **Appendix F5**.

**Table 6.5: Key Comments from Municipalities and Consideration by Project Team**

Municipality	Comment	Project Response	How Comments Were Considered by Project Team
Huron County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expect that the Project will likely demonstrate how it considered By-Law 7-2009 regarding wind energy facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project will attempt to comply with those aspects of the By-Law that are not contrary to the REA regulations and submissions proposed in the submitted application.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many aspects of the By-Law are contrary to Provincial Regulations, but will try to accommodate where it can.</li> </ul>
Huron County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested studies by qualified professionals on the pre-development background Low Frequency Noise in the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acoustical noise studies have been presented in accordance with REA requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Team is complying with required studies under REA.</li> </ul>
Huron County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that turbines should be located on vacant lots as they would be able to receive a residence while complying with regulated setback distances.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many years of negotiation were involved with local landowners to identify potential land available for turbines. All vacant non-participating property lots have potential “typical” residential locations identified for the purpose of the noise assessment and regulated setbacks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment noted by the Project Team.</li> </ul>
Huron County and Bluewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested as much combined work with Next Era regarding the transmission line. Does not wish to see two sets of infrastructure down the same corridor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland committed to having additional discussions with Next Era. Confirmed that two circuits would be required based on the Project size. This would be possible; however sharing transmission is difficult under the current contract conditions and specifications of Hydro One.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments noted and subject informally discussed with Next Era.</li> </ul>
Huron County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questioned what happens to the land surrounding the wind turbines once they are up. Suggested that vacant lands/ lands may require a noise study.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland confirmed that vacant lots were considered during the preparation of the noise study and for required setbacks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considered during REA studies.</li> </ul>
Huron County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested clarification with regard to the Parts/Service building.</li> <li>Suggested that this building be located in an existing urban area.</li> <li>Noted that they would not permit such a building to be located on prime agricultural land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland confirmed that they are generally located close to the transformer because the transformer requires maintenance.</li> <li>Committed to considering locations in the urban area.</li> <li>Committed to determining whether this building would be considered as part of the REA process or not.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative location being actively considered.</li> </ul>
Huron County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested re-locating the transformer shown on Figure 2E to Lot16 Concession 13.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland committed to investigating this option further.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Following investigation it was determined that there would be both noise issues with the</li> </ul>

**Table 6.5: Key Comments from Municipalities and Consideration by Project Team**

Municipality	Comment	Project Response	How Comments Were Considered by Project Team
			proposed location and potential environmental concerns.
Huron County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asked how emergency response would be addressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neegan Burnside confirmed that emergency response would be addressed in the Design and Operations Report.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Included in REA submissions.</li> </ul>
Huron East and West Perth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested clarification regarding the size and type of poles for the transmission line.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland confirmed that the poles will be 90ft and will be either wooden or steel (however wooden poles may be difficult to source). The poles will be approximately 24 inches at the base.</li> <li>Northland agreed to accommodate Hydro One and co-locate in the ROW if feasible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updates included in REA submissions.</li> </ul>
Huron East and Bluewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested that Northland use NextEra poles which are located one concession south of Northland's route.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland confirmed that discussions were held with Next Era with regard to using their poles; however noted that the lines become heavy if both projects were to use the same line. In addition, control and management of infrastructure becomes difficult and different connection points and voltages have been specified by Hydro One.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considered, but not possible.</li> </ul>
Huron County and South Huron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prefers that the power lines be buried for the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland explained that it is typically not economically feasible to bury higher voltage lines. Lower voltage lines will be buried, such as the underground collection system (up to the substation). Fibre optics will be located on the poles for Northland's own use (to control switch gear etc.).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under consideration.</li> </ul>
Huron County, South Huron, Huron East and West Perth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that stray voltage is a major concern of the public regarding the Project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland committed to addressing stray voltage at Public Meeting #1 and providing information on the Project website.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments addressed – stray voltage an issue with improperly grounded circuits. Grounding will be to the highest standard of the regulatory authorities.</li> </ul>

**Table 6.5: Key Comments from Municipalities and Consideration by Project Team**

Municipality	Comment	Project Response	How Comments Were Considered by Project Team
Perth County, South Huron, Huron East and West Perth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inquired about compensation for the use of road allowance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland explained that the benefit to municipalities is in the form of additional taxes and employment of local labour. Northland stated that they have been involved in other projects where they have developed a token fund to support local projects. Northland has agreed to suggestions, particularly once impacts are better understood.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Municipalities were to provide draft agreements for Northland's consideration. Nothing has been received to date from any municipalities.</li> </ul>
Huron County and South Huron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that viewscape, tourism and proximity to the lakeshore will be a main concern for residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neegan Burnside confirmed that a visual study is planned.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visual simulations were prepared and provided at public meetings and in the Design and Operations Report. Visual simulations confirmed very limited views from the lakeshore.</li> </ul>
Bluewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inquired as to source of the Project components.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland confirmed that they will meet the 50% Ontario content requirement. Steel will come from Ontario, towers will likely be formed in Ontario, Blades will be made in Tillsonburg, the generators and hub will be made in the USA or Europe.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will meet Ontario content requirements.</li> </ul>
Bluewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided municipal drains mapping. Noted that municipal drains are covered by a By-law (including municipal drains on private land). Private drainage tiles are not covered in the By-law.</li> <li>A permit applications is required if re-routing should take place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland committed to not impacting drainage tiles, overlaying the drainage information provided and reviewing any potential impacts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considerable work both completed and is underway to obtain approvals (outside REA) as required.</li> </ul>
Bluewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inquired about post-construction noise monitoring.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Northland committed to ensuring that all turbines operate within specification.</li> <li>Northland will consider site specific receptors if noise complaints are received.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Included in REA, Design and Operations report.</li> </ul>

## **6.6 CONSULTATION WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS**

### **6.6.1 Overview of Consultation with Local Elected Officials**

All mandatory Project notices were sent by mail to the following clerks of all upper and lower-tier municipalities where the Project is located, including the Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project (February 27, 2012), Notice of Draft Site Plan (April 17, 2012), Notice Draft REA Reports Public Review and Final Public Meeting (September 24, 2012), and Notice of Draft Site Plan Extension (October 22, 2012):

- Barb Wilson, CAO/Clerk, The County of Huron;
- Michael Di Lullo, Manager of Corporate Services/Clerk, Municipality of South Huron;
- Charlene Overholt, Deputy Clerk, Municipality of Bluewater;
- Brad Knight, CAO/Clerk, Municipality of Huron East;
- Bill Arthur, CAO, Perth County; and,
- Susan Cronin, Municipal Clerk, Municipality of West Perth.

The Project Team including representatives of Northland had the opportunity to present information about the Project to Bluewater staff on March 15, 2012. In attendance at the meeting was Bill Dowson, Mayor of the Municipality of Bluewater in Huron County. Although he attended the meeting and appreciated the information presented, he requested to not be added to the Project's distribution list.

On April 12, 2012, Bill Siemon attended Public Meeting #1 at Seaforth and District Community Centre in the Municipality of Huron East in his official capacity as Council Member of Huron East. At the meeting he provided a comment form. Key issues/concerns of the Huron East Council Member regarding the Project included:

- Northland's contribution to the Community Investment Fund; and,
- Pole sharing with Hydro One's high voltage and local power lines.

City officials including the Mayor and Councilors would have also been copied on responses to letters and e-mail in which the sender would have copied the officials in their correspondence.

### **6.6.2 Overview of Consultation with Federal and Provincial Elected Officials**

Each mandatory Notice issued for the Project (**Section 4.3**) was sent to the Member of Parliament (MP), Ben Lobb and Member of Provincial Parliament (MPP), Lisa M Thompson for Huron-Bruce.

To date, no comments have been received from the Federal or Provincial elected officials.

## **7.0 Aboriginal Engagement**

---

### **7.1 IDENTIFICATION OF ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES WITH AN INTEREST IN THE PROJECT**

The goal of Aboriginal consultation and engagement as it relates to the Project is to engage interested local Aboriginal communities in a way that is meaningful and respectful of their Aboriginal and treaty rights and interests in the Project area.

On January 30, 2012, as per O. Reg. 359/09, the Draft Project Description Report was provided to the Director of the MOE in order to obtain the Aboriginal Communities List as per section 14 of O. Reg. 359/09.

As per O. Reg. 359/09 S.14 (1) (b), a request was made to the Director of the MOE for a list of Aboriginal communities who:

- (i) Have or may have constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty rights that may be adversely impacted by the project, or*
- (ii) Otherwise may be interested in any negative environmental effects of the project.*

Prior to receiving the Aboriginal consultation list for the Project from the MOE, Neegan Burnside developed a contact list of Aboriginal communities, based on best professional judgment, which included a focus on communities within 150 km of the Project Study Area. Aboriginal engagement for the Project initially focused on the following local communities:

- Aamjiwnaang First Nation (or also known as Chippewas of Sarnia First Nation);
- Bkejwanong Territory (Walpole Island First Nation);
- Chippewas of Kettle & Stony Point First Nation;
- Chippewas of the Thames First Nation;
- Delaware Nation (Moravian of the Thames);
- Caldwell First Nation;
- Munsee-Delaware Nation;
- Six Nations of the Grand River Territory;
- Grand River Community Métis Council;
- Windsor-Essex Kent Métis Council; and,
- The Métis Nation of Ontario.

The March 20, 2012 letter from the MOE identified the following communities as either having constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights that may be adversely impacted by the Project or potential interest in the negative environmental effects of the Project:

- Chippewas of Kettle & Stony Point First Nation;
- Chippewas of the Thames First Nation;
- Aamjiwnaang First Nation;
- Bkejwanong Territory (Walpole Island First Nation);
- Oneida Nation of the Thames;
- Historic Saugeen Métis;
- Munsee-Delaware Nation; and,
- Delaware Nation (Moravian of the Thames Band).

Upon receiving the Aboriginal consultation list from the MOE, the Project distribution list was updated and consultation with Aboriginal communities regarding the Project included all Aboriginal communities as identified by the MOE. Only two communities (Oneidea Nation of the Thames and Historic Saugeen Metis were not included on the first list identified by Neegan Burnside). All Notices and Draft PDR was circulated to these additional communities on March 23 2012. Although the Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO) was not identified as having a potential interest in the Project by the MOE, based on experience with other projects, the Project Team added the MNO to the Aboriginal consultation list.

Summaries of engagement efforts, as well as comments and issues raised by the Aboriginal communities and the Project Team responses, are provided below. Tables containing the records of engagement and consultation activities for each Aboriginal community can be found in **Appendix G**.

## **7.1 COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES**

Since the start of the REA process, a variety of tools were used to communicate with local and interested Aboriginal communities. This section describes the consultation activities undertaken to ensure local and interested Aboriginal communities were kept informed of Project activities and had the opportunity to provide comments, questions and concerns regarding the Project. The Project distribution list for Aboriginal communities can be found in **Appendix B4**. Copies of Project Notices can be found in **Appendix C**.

### **7.1.1 Draft Project Description Report**

Prior to receiving the Aboriginal Communities List from the MOE, Aboriginal communities identified by Neegan Burnside (see **Section 7.1**) were provided with the Draft Project Description Report on February 23, 2012.

Upon receiving the Aboriginal consultation list from the MOE, Aboriginal communities not previously identified (Oneida Nation of the Thames, and Historic Saugeen Métis) were sent the Draft PDR on March 23, 2012.

### **7.1.2 Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project**

On February 23, 2012, the Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) was sent to Aboriginal communities identified by Neegan Burnside as having a potential interest in the Project (see **Section 7.1**). Upon receipt of the Aboriginal Communities List from the MOE, Aboriginal communities not previously identified (Oneida Nation of the Thames, and Historic Saugeen Métis) were sent the Notice on March 23, 2012.

### **7.1.3 Notice of Draft Site Plan**

On April 19, 2012, the Notice of Draft Site Plan was sent to Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation, Chippewas of the Thames First Nation, Aamjiwnaang First Nation, Bkejwanong Territory (Walpole Island First Nation), Oneida Nation of the Thames, Historic Saugeen Métis, Munsee-Delaware Nation, Delaware Nation, Moravian of the Thames Band, and Métis Nation of Ontario. Included with the Notice was the Draft Site Plan Report for review and comment.

### **7.1.4 Notice of Draft REA Reports Public Review and Notice of Final Public Meeting**

Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation, Chippewas of the Thames First Nation, Aamjiwnaang First Nation, Bkejwanong Territory (Walpole Island First Nation), Oneida Nation of the Thames, Historic Saugeen Métis, Munsee-Delaware Nation, Delaware Nation, Moravian of the Thames Band, and Métis Nation of Ontario were sent the Notice of Draft REA Reports Public Review and Final Public Meeting on September 24, 2012.

### **7.1.5 Notice of Draft Site Plan Extension**

Notice of Draft Site Plan Extension was distributed to Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation, Chippewas of the Thames First Nation, Aamjiwnaang First Nation, Bkejwanong Territory (Walpole Island First Nation), Oneida Nation of the Thames, Historic Saugeen Métis, Munsee-Delaware Nation, Delaware Nation, Moravian of the Thames Band, and Métis Nation of Ontario on October 29, 2012.

### **7.1.6 Local Newspaper Notices**

Project Notices were placed in local newspapers that serve communities within the County of Huron and Perth County including the local or lower-tier municipalities. **Section 4.4** provides a summary of the local newspapers and the dates on which the Project Notices were published throughout the REA process.



### **7.1.7 Project Telephone, E-mail, Mail and Website**

A Project e-mail address, at least two mailing addresses and a toll-free telephone hotline were published in Project Notices and on the Project website as a means for interested parties and community members to provide comments, concerns or submit questions regarding the Project. All Aboriginal communities on the list provided by the MOE including the Métis Nation of Ontario were called as well as sent letters including offers to arrange meetings with the Project Team should that be desired.

The Project website was used to provide updates of Project activities and information, upcoming Public Meeting information and consultation activities. Notices, Public Meeting display boards, Draft REA Reports, contact information, and relevant reference materials were also made available on the Project website.

### **7.1.8 Draft REA Reports**

Section 17(1)(3) of O. Reg. 359/09 requires that a summary of the REA documents in which Aboriginal communities have expressed an interest be provided to each Aboriginal community prior to the commencement of the public review period of the Draft REA Reports. In response to this requirement, the Project Team prepared Project Summaries of the Draft REA Reports and potential environmental effects. These summaries were provided to each Aboriginal community on August 27, 2012, in hard copy.

Please see **Appendix G4** for the Project Summary Report.

Supplementary documentation pertaining to the archaeological assessment was also provided to aboriginal communities in accordance with Section 7.6.2 of the Ministry of Tourism and Culture Standards and Guidelines, 2011.

As per O. Reg. 359/09 S.16 (5) (c and d), the Draft REA Reports were sent by courier and email (where available) to each Aboriginal community on the Project distribution list on August 27, 2012. Copies of the reports were sent to community representatives to be made available to members of the community for review. The Project Team requested that the documents be made available to staff and members of the communities during the 90-day review period.

Each Aboriginal community was requested to provide comments or feedback in writing on behalf of their community regarding any adverse impacts that the Project may have on any constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights, and any measures for mitigating those adverse impacts. The Project Team also extended an invitation to meet to further discuss the draft reports and the Project in greater detail.

## **7.2 OVERVIEW OF ABORIGINAL ENGAGEMENT**

An overview of Aboriginal engagement activities regarding the Project is provided below and specific details are provided in **Appendix G**.

### **7.2.1 Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation**

Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation (KSPFN) was contacted by the Project Team at the onset of the Project (prior to the start of the REA process) as the community was identified as being in close proximity to the Project Study Area and as potentially having an interest in the Project. The Ministry of the Environment also identified KSPFN as an Aboriginal Community that may have constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights that may be adversely impacted by the Project (O. Reg. 359/09 s14(b)(i)) in a letter dated March 20, 2012.

A number of additional discussions were held with KSPFN Band Council to discuss potential interest in partnership arrangements for the project.

To-date, no issues or concerns have been communicated to the Project Team by KSPFN.

A summary of all correspondence with KSPFN is provided in **Appendix G2**.

### **7.2.2 Chippewas of the Thames First Nation**

Chippewas of the Thames First Nation (COTTFN) was contacted by the Project Team at the onset of the Project (prior to the start of the REA process) as the community was identified as being in close proximity to the Project Study Area and as potentially having an interest in the Project. The Ministry of the Environment also identified the COTTFN as an Aboriginal Community that may have constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights that may be adversely impacted by the Project (O. Reg. 359/09 s14(b)(i)) in a letter dated March 20, 2012.

On February 23, 2012, the Project Team sent a letter providing an overview of the Project, current status of the Project in the REA process, the Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project, the Draft PDR, the anticipated Project schedule, and an outline of the REA Reports that would be provided for review and comment. The Project Team requested to be informed if COTTFN would like a copy of the Notice to be published in their local newspaper or posted at appropriate locations throughout their community. An offer was made to have meetings or public information centres within their community. The Project Team also requested in writing, any information that the community may have about any adverse impacts the Project may have on constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights, and any measures for mitigating adverse impacts.

COTTFN responded in an e-mail dated March 29, 2012, providing the contact for the new Director, Lands and Environment and indicating their interest in a meeting to learn more about the Project. COTTFN proposed two dates in April 2012 for the meeting with the Project Team.

On April 18, 2012, Northland and Neegan Burnside representatives met with COTTFFN staff to introduce the Project Team and present the Project proposal. COTTFFN provided an information package on the Lands & Environment Unit Consultation Team, which included a figure identifying COTTFFN treaties. Neegan Burnside made a presentation, using Pubic Meeting #1 display boards, on the overview of the Project, key steps in the REA process, potential environmental impacts and mitigation, and next steps in the process. Hard copies of the presentation were provided to COTTFFN. During the presentation, the following issues were discussed:

- Meetings held with other First Nations to date regarding the Project.
- Environmental and cultural heritage studies that would be undertaken for the Project.
- Northland's experience with other wind energy projects.
- Concerned about structural failure, cumulative issues, archaeology and species at risk.
- Inquired regarding First Nations monitors that were currently out on-site for the archaeological studies.
- Asked about the depth of the underground lines.
- Inquired as to how many landowners were involved in the Project.
- Asked how far below grade are the foundations.
- Inquired if anything grows beneath turbines.

Additional discussions during the meeting included:

- Noise associated with wind turbines;
- Weight of the turbines; and,
- Road user agreements.

COTTN confirmed that the Project is located within their traditional territory. Northland expressed interest in holding a Community Open House, should COTTFFN be interested.

The Notice of Draft Site Plan was sent on April 19, 2012. Attached to the Notice was a covering letter dated April 18, 2012. The letter indicated the purpose for distributing the Notice and, provided the locations where the Draft Site Plan Report including the proposed wind turbine layout map was made available for public review. On that same day, another cover letter (dated April 18, 2012) was sent to COTTFFN providing the Draft Site Plan Report. The Project Team requested that the report be made available for public review on or before April 23, 2012. Project contact information was included on both letters.

On August 27, 2012, the Draft REA Reports were provided to COTTFFN. Accompanying the Draft REA Reports was a covering letter dated August 27, 2012, providing an overview of the Project,

current status of the Project in the REA process, outline of the Draft REA Reports for review and comment, and the Project schedule. The Project Team offered to have a meeting to discuss the Draft REA Reports and requested in writing, any information that the community may have about any adverse impacts the Project may have on constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights, and any measures for mitigating adverse impacts.

To date, no written information or comments have been received regarding the Project from COTTFN.

A summary of all correspondence with COTTFN can be found in **Appendix G2**.

### **7.2.3 Aamjiwnaang First Nation**

Aamjiwnaang First Nation (AFN) (or also known as Chippewas of Sarnia First Nation), was contacted by the Project Team at the onset of the Project (prior to the start of the REA process) as the community was identified as being in close proximity to the Project Study Area and as potentially having an interest in the Project. The Ministry of the Environment also identified AFN as an Aboriginal Community that may have constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights that may be adversely impacted by the Project (O. Reg. 359/09 s14(b)(i)) in a letter dated March 20, 2012.

On February 23, 2012, the Project Team sent a letter providing an overview of the Project, current status of the Project in the REA process, the Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project, the Draft PDR, the anticipated Project schedule, and an outline of the REA Reports that would be provided for review and comment. The Project Team requested to be informed if AFN would like a copy of the Notice to be published in their local newspaper or posted at appropriate locations throughout their community. An offer was made to have meetings or public information centres within their community. The Project Team also requested in writing, any information that the community may have about any adverse impacts the Project may have on constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights, and any measures for mitigating adverse impacts.

The Notice of Draft Site Plan was sent on April 19, 2012. Attached to the Notice was a covering letter dated April 18, 2012. The letter indicated the purpose for distributing the Notice and, provided the locations where the Draft Site Plan Report including the proposed wind turbine layout map was made available for public review. On that same day, another cover letter (dated April 18, 2012) was sent to AFN providing the Draft Site Plan Report. The Project Team requested that the report be made available for public review on or before April 23, 2012. Project contact information was included on both letters.

A joint meeting with staff from AFN, Walpole Island First Nation (WIFN), and McLeod Wood Associates Inc. took place on June 6, 2012. Neegan Burnside provided a power point presentation, using Public Meeting #1 display boards. The presentation provided an overview of

the Project, potential environmental impacts and mitigation, and identified next steps in the REA process. During the presentation, the following items were discussed:

- Potential for First Nations field monitors to be on site during fieldwork activities.
- Both AFN and WIFN concerns about property values, bird/bat mortality and potential cumulative effects.
- WIFN suggested the possibility of off-site mitigation to compensate for potential effects on the natural environment.

Northland Power committed to undertaking a scoped cumulative effects assessment for the Project, with specific focus on the natural environment. Northland also committed to contacting AFN for future employment opportunities with regard to the Project and considering off-site mitigation. It was noted that First Nations had been invited by Dana Poulton & Associates to join in on-site archeological assessment work; however there was no response and the work is now completed. It was also indicated that there were no significant finds.

On August 27, 2012, the Draft REA Reports were provided to AFN. Accompanying the Draft REA Reports was a covering letter dated August 27, 2012, providing an overview of the Project, current status of the Project in the REA process, outline of the Draft REA Reports for review and comment, and the Project schedule. The Project Team offered to have a meeting to discuss the Draft REA Reports and requested in writing, any information that the community may have about any adverse impacts the Project may have on constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights, and any measures for mitigating adverse impacts.

In addition to the meetings involving the REA project team and project study work, a number of additional meetings were held with Band Council to discuss potential interest in partnership arrangements for the project.

A summary of all correspondence with AFN can be found in **Appendix G2**.

#### **7.2.4 Aamjiwnaang First Nation Community Open House**

##### **Community Open House #1- June 2012**

At the request of Aamjiwnaang First Nation (AFN) staff, a Community Open House for the Project was held on June 6, 2012 from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at a Community Centre located on reserve. AFN staff was responsible for advertising the Open House within the community.

The Open House was held as a forum for AFN community members to learn more about the Project and to convey their issues/concerns and suggestions regarding the Project. It was also to discuss the potential involvement of AFN as business partners in the Project. A presentation was made to all attendees and thirteen (13) display boards were available for viewing, providing background information on Northland, the Project, the REA process, key Project activities, the Project schedule and next steps in the REA process. Display boards used at WIFN Community

Open House on May 23, 2012 was also displayed at AFN's Community Open House. A copy of the display boards is provided in **Appendix G5**. A Northland representative and members of the Project Team were available to provide additional information about the Project, to discuss the content of the display boards, and to answer questions related to the Project within their area of expertise and seek attendees' feedback regarding the Project.

Relevant academic and industry studies relevant to wind power and noise/health effects were also made available for attendees to review and discuss with the Project Team. As required by O. Reg. 359/09, copies of the Draft Project Description Report (dated February 2012) were also displayed.

Community members were asked to sign the registration sheet and were provided with a comment form should they wish to document their issues/ concerns regarding the Project.

A total of 14 First Nation members attended the Open House. One Northland representative and two members of the Project Team were also in attendance.

No comment forms were received from First Nation members at the meeting.

### **Community Open House #2- December 2012**

A second Open House was held on December 10, 2012 from 6:30 p.m. to 8:45 p.m. at a Community Centre located on reserve. AFN staff was responsible for advertising the Open House within the community.

The Open House was organized as a formal presentation and Question and Answer (Q & A) Session. The purpose of the Open House was to provide an update on the Project to community members, the results of the REA studies, and the Draft REA Reports and gather feedback. As a follow up to the first Open House, discussions were held regarding the potential involvement of AFN as business partners in the Project. The majority of the display boards that were used for the Final Public Meeting were provided for viewing at AFN's second Open House (see **Appendix D3**).

Relevant academic and industry studies related to wind power and noise/health effects were also made available for attendees to review and discuss with the Project Team. As required by O. Reg. 359/09, copies of all of the Draft Project Reports were also available for viewing.

Community members were asked to sign the registration sheet. A total of 29 community members attended the Open House including Chief Christopher Plain and Council Members. One Northland and 5 members of the Project Team were available to provide additional information about the Project, to discuss the content of the display boards, and to answer questions related to the Project within their area of expertise and seek attendees' feedback regarding the Project.

Introductory remarks were made by Chief Christopher Plain. Northland and the Project Team representatives followed with a presentation, providing information on Northland, an overview of the Project and the REA process, the Project schedule, results of the Noise and Visual Assessments and the REA environmental studies, Health considerations, the transmission line route, a summary of the potential effects and mitigation measures and a list of any changes in the Project as a result of feedback received. The display boards provided were the same as the presentation slides. Following the presentation, First Nation members were given the opportunity to provide their comments, issues and concerns regarding the Project.

Questions and comments made by the First Nation members during the Q&A session related to:

- Potential impacts to Tundra Swans;
- Bat surveys;
- The Health Canada study currently underway that will explore the relationship between wind turbine noise and health effects;
- Consultation to date with potentially affected landowners;
- Northland's experience with renewable energy projects;
- Revenue generation of the lifespan of the Project;
- Maintenance of turbines; and,
- Closure of coal plant.

### **7.2.5 Walpole Island First Nation**

Walpole Island First Nation (WIFN) was contacted by the Project Team at the onset of the Project (prior to the start of the REA process) as the community was identified as being in close proximity to the Project Study Area and as potentially having an interest in the Project. The Ministry of the Environment also identified WIFN as an Aboriginal Community that may have constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights that may be adversely impacted by the Project (O. Reg. 359/09 s14(b)(i)) in a letter dated March 20, 2012.

On February 23, 2012, the Project Team sent a letter providing an overview of the Project, current status of the Project in the REA process, the Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project, the Draft PDR, the anticipated Project schedule, and an outline of the REA Reports that would be provided for review and comment. The Project Team requested to be informed if WIFN would like a copy of the Notice to be published in their local newspaper or posted at appropriate locations throughout their community. An offer was made to have meetings or public information centres within their community. The Project Team also requested in writing, any information that the community may have about any adverse impacts the Project may have on constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights, and any measures for mitigating adverse impacts.



The Notice of Draft Site Plan was sent on April 19, 2012. Attached to the Notice was a covering letter dated April 18, 2012. The letter indicated the purpose for distributing the Notice and, provided the locations where the Draft Site Plan Report including the proposed wind turbine layout map was made available for public review. On that same day, another cover letter (dated April 18, 2012) was sent to WIFN providing the Draft Site Plan Report. The Project Team requested that the report be made available for public review on or before April 23, 2012. Project contact information was included on both letters.

A joint meeting with staff from AFN, Walpole Island First Nation (WIFN), and McLeod Wood Associates Inc. took place on June 6, 2012. Please refer to **Section 7.2.3** for a summary of the meeting, including items discussed at the meeting.

On August 27, 2012, the Draft REA Reports were provided to WIFN. Accompanying the Draft REA Reports was a covering letter dated August 27, 2012, providing an overview of the Project, current status of the Project in the REA process, outline of the Draft REA Reports for review and comment, and the Project schedule. The Project Team offered to have a meeting to discuss the Draft REA Reports and requested in writing, any information that the community may have about any adverse impacts the Project may have on constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights, and any measures for mitigating adverse impacts.

In addition to the meetings involving the REA project team and project study work, a number of additional meetings were held with Band Council to discuss potential interest in partnership arrangements for the project.

To date, no written information or comments have been received regarding the Project from WIFN.

A summary table of all correspondence with WIFN can be found in **Appendix G2**.

### **7.2.6 Walpole Island First Nation Community Open House**

#### **Community Open House #1 – May 2012**

At the request of Walpole Island First Nation (WIFN) staff, a Community Open House for the Project was held on May 23, 2012 from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at a Community Centre located on reserve. WIFN staff was responsible for advertising the event within the community.

The Open House was held as a forum for WIFN community members to learn more about the Project and to convey their issues/concerns and suggestions regarding the Project. It was also to discuss the potential involvement of WIFN as business partners in the Project. A presentation was made to all attendees and thirteen (13) display boards were available for viewing, providing background information on Northland, the Project, the REA process, key Project activities, the Project schedule and next steps in the REA process. A copy of the display boards is provided in **Appendix G5**. A Northland representative and members of the Project Team were available to



provide additional information about the Project, to discuss the content of the display boards, and to answer questions related to the Project within their area of expertise and seek attendees' feedback regarding the Project.

Relevant academic and industry studies relevant to wind power and noise/health effects were also made available for attendees to review and discuss with the Project Team. As required by O. Reg. 359/09, copies of the Draft Project Description Report (dated February 2012) were also displayed.

Community members were asked to sign the registration sheet and were provided with a comment form, should they wish to document their issues/ concerns regarding the Project. A total of 29 First Nation members attended the Open House, including WIFN staff and Council members. One Northland representative and two members of the Project Team were also in attendance.

The Project Team encouraged community members to submit written comments regarding the information presented. At the Open House, 3 comment forms were received. A summary of the written comments submitted is provided in **Appendix G3**.

Key comments, issues and concerns addressed within the written comment forms relate to:

- Support for the potential partnership between WIFN and Grand Bend Wind Limited Partnership;
- Potential job opportunities for First Nation members; and,
- Advance notification of meetings.

### **Community Open House #1 – February 2013**

Again at the request of WIFN staff, a second Community Open House for the Project was held on February 6, 2013 from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the Community Centre located on reserve. WIFN staff was responsible for advertising the event within the community.

The purpose of the Open House was to provide an update on the Project to community members, the results of the REA studies, and the Draft REA Reports and gather feedback. As a follow up to the first Open House, discussions were held regarding the potential involvement of WIFN as business partners in the Project. The majority of the display boards that were used for the Final Public Meeting were provided for viewing at WIFN's second Open House (see **Appendix D3**).

Relevant academic and industry studies related to wind power and noise/health effects were also made available for attendees to review and discuss with the Project Team. As required by O. Reg. 359/09, copies of all of the Draft Project Reports were also available for viewing.

Community members were asked to sign the registration sheet and were provided with a comment form, should they wish to document their issues/ concerns regarding the Project. Ninety three (93) First Nation members attended the Open House, including WIFN staff, the Chief and some Council members. Consultants representing WIFN' business interests also attended. One Northland representative and three members of the Project Team were also in attendance.

The Project Team encouraged community members to submit written comments regarding the information presented. At the Open House, 8 comment forms were received. A summary of the written comments submitted is provided in **Appendix G3**.

Key comments, issues and concerns addressed within the written comment forms related to:

- Environmental risks;
- Poor investment choices in the past and unappealing distribution of funding;
- Bird migration impacts;
- Inadequate future consultation will occur if they sign now;
- Harassment from other First Nation groups that oppose the wind farm; want to ensure Northland will address potential opposition;
- Start date and commencement of power generation;
- Turbine width and size;
- Local communities and other First Nations agreeing with the Project ;
- Benefits to community (funding received, allocation of funding, job creation);
- Costs Walpole will be responsible for;
- Failure of the Project; concern with who's responsible for repairs of turbines if damages occur (i.e., from storms, or general wear), decommissioning, etc.;
- Jeopardy to Land claims;
- Questioned if the same message is being delivered to the First Nation people in Sarnia; and,
- Taxes.

Key interests/concerns checked off on comment sheets related to:

- Potential impacts on archaeological/ cultural resources;
- Potential impacts to the natural environment; and,
- Potential impacts to tourism.

It should be noted that responses to these questions and many others were provided at the meeting.

### **7.2.7 Oneida Nation of the Thames**

The Ministry of the Environment identified Oneida Nation of the Thames (ONT) as an Aboriginal community that may have constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights that may be adversely impacted by the Project (O. Reg. 359/09 s14(b)(i)) in a letter dated March 20, 2012.

To-date, no issues or concerns have been communicated to the Project Team by ONT.

A summary of all correspondence with ONT is provided in **Appendix G2**.

### **7.2.8 Historic Saugeen Métis**

The Ministry of the Environment identified Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) as an Aboriginal community that may have constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights that may be adversely impacted by the Project (O. Reg. 359/09 s14(b)(i)) in a letter dated March 20, 2012.

On March 23, 2012, the Project Team sent a letter providing an overview of the Project, current status of the Project in the REA process, the Notice of Proposal and Notice of Public Meeting (#1) to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project, the Draft PDR, the anticipated Project schedule, and an outline of the REA Reports that would be provided for review and comment. The Project Team requested to be informed if HSM would like a copy of the Notice to be published in their local newspaper or posted at appropriate locations throughout their community. An offer was made to have meetings or public information centres within their community. The Project Team also requested in writing, any information that the community may have about any adverse impacts the Project may have on constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights, and any measures for mitigating adverse impacts.

On June 11, 2012, representatives from Northland, Neegan Burnside and HSM held an introductory meeting to introduce the Project Team, to present the Project proposal and to ensure HSM concerns are identified early and addressed where possible. HSM provided general background information on the history of HSM and the prospectus for the community. Subsequently, Neegan Burnside provided a power point presentation, using Public Meeting #1 display boards. The presentation provided an overview of the Project, potential environmental impacts and mitigation, and identified next steps in the REA process. Information discussed during the presentation included:

- HSM inquired if Northland is responsible for constructing the transmission line.
- Land Lease Agreements.
- HSM indicated their interest in the results of the archaeological fieldwork.
- Potential partnership or economic opportunities.

- Project decommissioning.
- HSM inquired if renewable power will affect the price of their hydro bill.
- HSM confirmed that they will provide comments on the Draft Project Description Report.
- Community benefits such as education and sustainability.
- Capacity funding to cover meeting costs and review of Draft REA Reports.
- HSM expressed concerns regarding long term, unknown impacts.
- HSM requested a Letter of Intent for long term discussions and committed to providing a draft of this letter for review.

Northland requested a proposal from HSM for review and consideration. A follow-up letter was sent to Northland on June 20, 2012 from HSM with background information on their aboriginal rights. HSM also provided input with regard to the potential impacts of the Project on their aboriginal rights, interest, and way of life. Two draft schedules were provided with this letter for consideration by Northland; a draft Schedule B related to the capacity budget and a draft Schedule C regarding long-term community benefits as a result of the Project.

Following receipt of this letter, Northland regularly communicated with HSM through telephone calls and e-mails regarding the capacity budget and Letter of Intent.

The Notice of Draft Site Plan was sent on April 19, 2012. Attached to the Notice was a covering letter dated April 18, 2012. The letter indicated the purpose for distributing the Notice and, provided the locations where the Draft Site Plan Report including the proposed wind turbine layout map was made available for public review. On that same day, another cover letter (dated April 18, 2012) was sent to HSM providing the Draft Site Plan Report. The Project Team requested that the report be made available for public review on or before April 23, 2012. Project contact information was included on both letters.

On August 27, 2012, the Draft REA Reports were provided to HSM. Accompanying the Draft REA Reports was a covering letter dated August 27, 2012, providing an overview of the Project, current status of the Project in the REA process, outline of the Draft REA Reports for review and comment, and the Project schedule. The Project Team offered to have a meeting to discuss the Draft REA Reports and requested in writing, any information that the community may have about any adverse impacts the Project may have on constitutionally protected aboriginal or treaty rights, and any measures for mitigating adverse impacts.

On September 26, 2012, Northland met again with HSM. At the meeting, HSM provided a historical background on their community and their rights in the area and a copy of the "Principles for Proponents Working in the Traditional Territories of the HSM". Items discussed at the meeting included:

- Other Metis communities identified on the MOE Aboriginal Communities List that Northland were required to consult regarding the Project.

- Capacity budget proposal submitted to Northland on June 20, 2012.

Northland agreed to provide additional funding to cover HSM internal and external costs and committed to drafting a letter agreement setting out the amount and terms for this commitment. On December 20, 2012 Northland and HSM signed an agreement where Northland agrees to help fund HSM's review of the archeological and natural heritage assessments in the draft REA reports.

A summary of all correspondence with HSM can be found in **Appendix G2**.

### **7.2.9 Munsee-Delaware Nation**

Munsee-Delaware First Nation (MDFN) was contacted by the Project Team at the onset of the Project (prior to the start of the REA process) as the community was identified as being in close proximity to the Project Study Area and as potentially having an interest in the Project. The MOE confirmed that MDFN may be interested in any negative environmental effects of the Project (O. Reg. 359/09 s14(b)(ii)) in a letter dated March 20, 2012.

To-date, no issues or concerns have been communicated to the Project Team by MDFN.

A summary of all correspondence with MDFN is provided in **Appendix G2**.

### **7.2.10 Delaware First Nation**

Delaware First Nation (Moravian of the Thames) was contacted by the Project Team at the onset of the Project (prior to the start of the REA process) as the community was identified as being in close proximity to the Project Study Area and as potentially having an interest in the Project. The MOE confirmed that Delaware First Nation may be interested in any negative environmental effects of the Project (O. Reg. 359/09 s14(b)(ii)) in a letter dated March 20, 2012.

To-date, no issues or concerns have been communicated to the Project Team by Delaware First Nation.

A summary of all correspondence with Delaware First Nation is provided in **Appendix G2**.

### **7.2.11 Métis Nation of Ontario**

The MOE did not identify the Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO) as having a potential interest in the Project; however based on experience with other projects, the Project Team added the MNO to the Aboriginal consultation list.

To-date, no issues or concerns have been communicated to the Project Team by MNO.

A summary of all correspondence with MNO is provided in **Appendix G2**.

## **8.0 Plan for Ongoing Consultation**

---

Northland will continue with consultation activities following submission of the REA application to MOE, during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Project. Northland has documented the communication plan for emergencies, Project updates and activities and an on-going communications and issues protocol in Section 6.0 of the Design and Operations Report.

### **8.1 FINAL REA REPORTS**

Once the MOE has deemed the REA application complete, Northland will provide copies of the Final REA Reports on the Project website until the Director of the MOE makes a decision under section 47.5 of the *Environmental Protection Act*.

### **8.2 COMMUNITY UPDATES**

Northland and/or the Project Contractor would engage with community members (local community members, Aboriginal communities, and local Counties/Municipalities) during all phases of the Project, including providing updates on the Project website ([www.grandbend.northlandpower.ca](http://www.grandbend.northlandpower.ca)). As a long-term presence and neighbour in Huron and Perth Counties, Northland would continue to develop contacts and maintain local relationships and channels of communication. Additional updates may be provided to community members via the website, letters, local newspaper notices, and/or through direct contact.

Northland will provide a status update to the public, Aboriginal communities and local Counties/Municipalities regarding the commencement of the Environmental Registry comment period. Within ten (10) days of Northland's application for the Project being posted on the Environmental Bill of Rights (EBR) by the MOE, Northland will publish a Notice in local newspapers and on the Project website ([www.grandbend.northlandpower.ca](http://www.grandbend.northlandpower.ca)), providing public notice that the Project application has been accepted for review by the Ministry. The notice will include Project information, the Project website ([www.grandbend.northlandpower.ca](http://www.grandbend.northlandpower.ca)) where final documents can be viewed, and a statement that members of the public can submit comments to the MOE Approvals Director via the EBR.

#### **Communication Plan for Emergencies**

In the event of an emergency, Northland and/or the Project Contractor would initiate the Emergency Response and Communications Plan as outlined in Section 6.0 of the Design and Operations Report.

The plan would include key contact information for emergency service providers, a description of the chain of communications and how information would be disseminated between Northland and/or the Contractor and the relevant responders. The plan would also indicate how Northland and/or the Contractor would notify the community so that the appropriate actions could be taken

to protect community members' health and safety. The communication plan for emergencies would be developed in collaboration with local emergency responders, and would be prepared following consultations with the local Emergency Services Department, including the local fire department. Northland also intends to participate with local municipal staff in training sessions specific to the Project prior to Project construction.

### **8.3 COMMUNICATIONS AND ISSUE RESPONSE PROTOCOL**

The following has been developed for all Project phases to address any reasonable concern from the public and would be implemented by Northland and/or the Project Contractor.

A telephone number for contacting Northland and/or the Project Contractor along with the mailing/e-mail address would be posted on the Project website ([www.grandbend.northlandpower.ca](http://www.grandbend.northlandpower.ca)) and provided directly to the local municipality and the MOE. These would be the direct contact points for Northland and/or the Project Contractor during all phases of the Project. The Emergency Response and Communications Plan would include key contact information for emergency service providers, a description of the chain of communications and how information would be disseminated between Northland and/or the Contractor and the relevant responders. This information would be obtained during consultations with the local Emergency Services Departments.

The telephone number provided for the reporting of concerns, issues and/or complaints would be equipped with a voice message system used to record the caller's contact information and the time, date and details of the concern and/or issue. All messages would be recorded in an Issue Response Document to maintain a record of all issues and concerns. Northland and/or the Project Contractor would endeavour to respond to messages within 48 hours. All reasonable commercial efforts would be made to take appropriate action as a result of issues and concerns, as soon as practicable. The actions taken to remediate the cause of the issue or complaint and the proposed actions to be taken to prevent reoccurrences of the same complaint in the future would also be recorded within the Issue Response Document. If appropriate, the MOE Spills Action Centre would be contacted to notify them of the issue. Correspondence would be shared with other stakeholders, such as the MOE, as required and/or as deemed appropriate.

Ongoing communication with community members would allow Northland and/or the Project Contractor to receive and respond to community issues on an ongoing basis.

## **9.0 Closure**

---

This Consultation Report for the Grand Bend Wind Farm Project has been prepared in accordance with Item 2, Table 1 of Ontario Regulation 359/09, and the *Technical Guide to Renewable Energy Approvals* (MOE, March 2012).

This report may not be used by any third party without the express written consent of Northland.

### **STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.**



---

**Fiona Christiansen, M.Sc**  
Senior Project Manager  
Stantec Consulting Ltd.  
Suite 1 - 70 Southgate Drive  
Guelph, ON N1G 4P5  
519-836-6050 ext. 307  
[Fiona.Christiansen@stantec.com](mailto:Fiona.Christiansen@stantec.com)

### **NEEGAN BURNSIDE LTD.**



---

**Lyle Parsons, B.E.S.**  
Project Manager  
Neegan Burnside Ltd.  
292 Speedvale Avenue West, Unit 20  
Guelph, ON N1H 1C4  
519-941-5331  
[lyle.parsons@neeganburnside.com](mailto:lyle.parsons@neeganburnside.com)

### **Northland Power Inc.**



---

**Jim Mulvale, P.Eng.**  
Manager, Environmental, Health and Safety  
Northland Power Inc.  
30 St. Clair Avenue West, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, ON M4A 3A1  
647-288-1273  
[jim.mulvale@northlandpower.ca](mailto:jim.mulvale@northlandpower.ca)