

Project Report

August 15, 2011

**Northland Power Inc.
Rideau Lakes Solar Project**

Consultation Report

Table of Contents

1. Overview	5
1.1 Project Description	5
1.2 Legislative Requirements.....	5
1.3 The Consultation Process	7
2. Consultation with the Public	9
2.1 Methods of Consultation	9
2.2 List of Stakeholders	10
2.3 Details and Results of Consultation	10
2.3.1 First Public Meeting and Notice	10
2.3.2 Final Public Meeting and Notice	11
2.3.3 Other Public Consultation	12
2.4 Public Comments and Concerns	13
3. Consultation with Agencies.....	23
3.1 Agencies	23
3.1.1 Ontario Ministry of Environment	23
3.1.2 Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources.....	24
3.1.3 Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture	25
3.1.4 Rideau Valley Conservation Authority	26
3.1.5 United Counties of Leeds and Grenville	26
3.1.6 Township of Rideau Lakes.....	26
3.1.7 Parks Canada.....	27
3.2 Agency Comments and Concerns.....	28
4. Consultation with Aboriginal Communities.....	31
4.1 Aboriginal Community Consultation List.....	31
4.2 Consultation Activities	31
4.2.1 First Public Meeting and Notice	31
4.2.2 Final Public Meeting and Notice	32
4.3 Other Aboriginal Consultation Activities	32
4.4 Aboriginal Comments and Concerns	34
5. Conclusions.....	37
6. References.....	39

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

List of Tables

Table 1.1	Legislative Requirements – Concordance Table.....	6
Table 2.1	Comments/Concerns from Public and Responses	13
Table 3.1	Comments/Concern From Agencies and Responses.....	28
Table 4.1	Details of Additional Consultation Activities.....	32
Table 4.2	Comments/Concerns from Aboriginal Communities and Responses	35

Blank back

1. Overview

1.1 Project Description

Northland Power Solar Rideau Lakes L.P. (hereinafter referred to as “Northland”) is proposing to develop a 10-megawatt (MW) solar photovoltaic project titled the Rideau Lakes Solar Project (hereinafter referred to as the “Project”). The Project will be located on approximately 50 hectares (ha) of land, located at 360 Narrows Lock Road in the Township of Rideau Lakes, within the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville, in Ontario.

1.2 Legislative Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 1.1 Legislative Requirements – Concordance Table

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

1.3 The Consultation Process

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

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

The following report provides

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

Blank back

2. Consultation with the Public

2.1 Methods of Consultation

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

- Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project/Notice of Public Meeting
 - ◆ direct mail to all identified landowners within 120 metres of the Project location (a full list of landowners is provided in Appendix A, as well as interested parties identified through Public Consultation efforts, although personal information has been kept confidential). A total of 15 notices were issued on July 20, 2010 for the first public meeting.
 - ◆ posting on two separate occasions on Thursday, July 22, 2010 and Thursday, July 29, 2010 in *The Review Mirror*, which has general circulation in the Project area. These notices are included in Appendix B
- Notice of Final Public Meeting
 - ◆ direct mail to all identified landowners within 120 metres of the Project location (a full list of landowners is provided in Appendix A). A total of 41 notices were issued on January 04, 2011 for the final public meeting.
 - ◆ posting on two separate occasions on Thursday, January 6, 2011 and Thursday, February 10, 2011 in *The Smiths Falls EMC*, which has general circulation in the Project area. These notices are included in Appendix B
- a website (www.northlandpower.ca/rideaulakes) with Project and Northland information, Notices and Project documents posted when available
- hard copies of the Project Description Report and supporting Project documents available for review at the Township of Rideau Lakes municipal office
- first and final public meetings
- means to obtain comments on the Project by having comment sheets available at first and final public meetings and advertisement of phone numbers, fax and emails for the public to make comments
- one hardcopy of Draft Project Description Report available at the first public meeting and all the Draft REA project documents available for review at the final public meeting
- handouts (printed copies of boards) available at the public meetings.

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

2.2 List of Stakeholders

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

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

2.3 Details and Results of Consultation

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

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

2.3.1 First Public Meeting and Notice

The Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project and Public Meeting was published 30 days prior to the event in the *Review Mirror* on Thursday, July 22, 2010 and again on Thursday, July 29, 2010. The *Review Mirror* is a local paper with weekly publication, circulating from Westport into the surrounding Rideau Lakes township. Notices and covering letter were sent by regular mail to all identified landowners within 120 m of the Project location. A total of 15 stakeholders were mailed a notification on July 20, 2010. The letters are contained in Appendix B along with the Notices published in the *Review Mirror*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Two (2) comment sheets were received during or following the first public meeting (see Section 2.4 for comments and responses.)

2.3.2 Final Public Meeting and Notice

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

An updated mailing list, including any newly identified names and contact details was used for the mail out (see Appendix A). A total of 41 stakeholders were issued covering letters and the Notice of Public Meeting on January 4, 2011. A copy of this Notice as it appeared in *The Smiths Falls EMC* and a copy of the letter that accompanied the Notice are provided in Appendix B.

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

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

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

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

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

A total of twenty two (22) people signed in at the final public meeting.

The final public meeting followed an open house format with project details presented on display boards and printed copies available to visitors. This approach allowed for one-on-one discussions between representatives of Northland, Hatch and the public. Display boards provided general information on Northland and Project, with an overview of the information found in the Project documents. A copy of the Project documents were available for review and discussion at the final public meeting. Copies of this information can be found in Appendix D. Questions at the final public meeting were answered by both Northland and Hatch. Comments sheets were available at the second meeting to be filled in by the participants if they chose to do so. Northland Power and Hatch staff kept notes of conversations with attendees and also encouraged attendees to fill out comment sheets. A total of three (3) comment sheets were completed as a result of the final public meeting. Appendix E contains copies of the comment sheets.

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

2.3.3 Other Public Consultation

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

- email correspondence
- phone calls
- mail
- fax.

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

Prior to the final public meeting, a Northland representative met with a concerned landowner who lives in the proximity of the Project location on February 9th, 2011. The purpose of the meeting was to address any concerns prior to the final public meeting, provide visual renderings of the proposed

Project for discussion, and identify any suggested changes to the Project. Where appropriate, these changes were incorporated into the reports prior to the final public meeting (See table 2.1).

2.4 Public Comments and Concerns

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

Table 2.1 Comments/Concerns from Public and Responses

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

<p>Visual Impact</p>	<p>On August 15, 2010 an email was sent to Hatch stating "Secondly I feel that the solar projects should be visually screened from the road. The solar "farms" I have seen to date have been very unattractive – a jarring contrast when encountered on a drive through the countryside; in short, visually, they have a considerable negative environmental impact. This negative impact could be mitigated by screening the projects from the road by sensitive planting or some other means. Obviously the screening would have to be done in such a way that it would not impair the effectiveness of the solar panels and also in such a way that the screening itself did not represent a visual intrusion."</p>	<p>On August 16, 2010 an response was sent stating "In respect of potential visual impacts associated with the Projects, Northland Power has noted your concern in this regard. Northland Power is considering visual screening for each Project on a case-by-case basis. A determination as to whether visual screening will be implemented, and what forms such visual screening may take if implemented, has not been made at this time."</p> <p>Following further Project design in 2011, Northland maintains that the setback of solar panels from the public roadway (by a minimum of 50 m) is sufficient to mitigate visual impacts.</p> <p>A communications plan has been developed for the Project. Should concerns be raised during the Project construction or operations phases, Northland will meet with the concerned individual(s) to discuss their concerns and determine if additional mitigation is warranted.</p>
<p>Comments/Questions Received via Comment Sheets at First Public Meeting – August 24, 2010</p>		
<p>Health Impacts</p>	<p>Concern about the health impacts. Requested a Risk Assessment by a non-participant.</p>	<p>Electrical equipment used in association with the solar project are present throughout Ontario in association with electrical infrastructure. No health effects of these types of equipment have been noted within the scientific literature. It is not anticipated that the Project will impact human health. Therefore, a risk assessment is not necessary.</p>
<p>Wildlife Impacts</p>	<p>Would like an environmental survey to determine what species will be displaced (including mammals, reptiles, plants and beneficial insects)</p>	<p>Environmental surveys to determine the species on site and within 120 m have been completed and are identified within the Natural Heritage Site Investigation Report. Potential impacts to wildlife and plants are assessed, and mitigation measures identified, within the Natural Heritage Environmental Impact Study, and the Construction Plan Report. Please see these reports for comprehensive information on the surveys, results and environmental impacts.</p>

Water Quality	Recommends studies regarding the water quality and impacts from this Project be completed	<p>Through consultation with the Kingston District Office of the Ministry of the Environment , Northland has identified a proposed Baseline Water Well Monitoring Program and Construction Response Plan. Copies of this document were made available at the final public meeting, and are enclosed within this Application.</p> <p>Impacts to surface and groundwater quality are also addressed within the Waterbodies Environmental Impact Study.</p>
Government	Why should this Project receive a go ahead before existing approved sites (farmers in local area have invested money) are operating?	This question relates to government policies and therefore cannot be answered by Northland. . The Project will not proceed until all government requirements are met.
Comments/Questions Received via Email Between First and Final Public Meeting		
120 m from Project location on Figures	On August 26, 2010, an email was received with the following comment "Set back - buffer zone- why is the buffer zone not located on the land that you have leased"	<p>Response sent on January 4, 2011stated "The figures showed a buffer from the Project location. This buffer was mislabelled and actually reflects a distance of 120 m from the Project location which we are required to consider during the Renewable Energy Approval process"</p> <p>Following this response, on February 9, 2011,Northland met with the individual who sent this email, to further discuss their concerns..During the meeting Northland reviewed copies of the layout from the Construction Plan Report as well as a visual rendering of the Project. The individual concerned appreciated Northland's efforts to consult with them and the effort made to keep the Project away from the main roadway. No further comments or concerns were raised during this meeting or since the date of this report.</p>

<p>Noise and Odour</p>	<p>On August 26, 2010, an email was received with the following comment "Noise & Odour? Locate transformers as far back as possible from road"</p>	<p>Response sent on January 4, 2011 stated "We do not anticipate that there will be an odour emitted from the Project during operations. Presence of construction machinery will necessitate some emissions of exhaust, however the majority of construction will occur away from nearby receptors."</p> <p>A Noise Study has been completed on the Project in order to ensure that the Project meets provincial requirements for noise. This report is available for your review along with all of the Project documentation"</p> <p>Following this response, on February 9, 2011 Northland met with the individual who sent this email, to further discuss their concerns. During the meeting Northland reviewed the results of the Noise Study. The individual concerned seemed satisfied with the results of the Noise Study. No further concerns were raised related to noise at the meeting.</p>
<p>Restrictions on adjacent properties</p>	<p>On August 26, 2010, an email was received with the following comment "Will the properties across from this solar farm have restrictions on them? example – hunting"</p>	<p>Response sent on January 4, 2011 stated that "There will be no restrictions on properties adjacent to the solar farm"</p> <p>Following this response, on February 9, 2011 Northland met with the individual who sent this email, to further discuss their concerns. The individual concerned appreciated Northland's efforts to consult with them. No further comments or concerns were raised during this meeting or since.</p>

<p>TV and Radio</p>	<p>On August 26, 2010, an email was received with the following comment "Will this solar -transformers affect our TV and radio?"</p>	<p>Response sent on January 4, 2011 stated "It is not expected that the solar project will impact TV or radio reception. Components of a solar project are generally low to the ground (when compared with wind power), and would therefore not be expected to interfere with the transmission of these signals."</p> <p>Following this response, on February 9, 2011, Northland met with the individual who sent this email, to further discuss their concerns. The individual concerned appreciated Northland's efforts to consult with them. No further comments or concerns were raised during this meeting or since the date of this report.</p>
<p>Water Quality</p>	<p>On August 26, 2010, an email was received with the following comment "This property floods each spring, is there any run off of waste that might harm the water table"</p>	<p>Response sent on January 4, 2011 stated "Consideration of stormwater runoff has been incorporated into the design of the Project. Hazardous materials associated with the Project are limited and measures will be in place to ensure that runoff will not contaminate the water table" Note that oil (not containing PCBs) in the inverters/transformers are th only potentially hazardous material on site.</p> <p>Impacts to water quality are addressed within the Waterbodies Environmental Impact Study.</p> <p>Following this response, on February 9, 2011, Northland met with the individual who sent this email, to further discuss their concerns.. The individual concerned appreciated Northland's efforts to consult with them. No further comments or concerns were raised during this meeting or since the date of this report.</p>

<p>World Heritage Site</p>	<p>On August 26, 2010, an email was received with the following comment "This area has been designated as "World Heritage" what will this do to this designation"</p>	<p>Response sent on January 4, 2011 stated "The Project will not impact the designation of the area as a World Heritage site. Consultation with Parks Canada was undertaken to ensure that there would be no impact to the Rideau Canal Heritage River"</p> <p>Following this response, on February 9, 2011, Northland met with the individual who sent this email, to further discuss their concerns. The individual concerned appreciated Northland's efforts to consult with them. No further comments or concerns were raised during this meeting or since the date of this report.</p>
<p>Site entrance - Safety</p>	<p>On August 26, 2010, an email was received with the following comment "The Narrows Lock Road has a high traffic count, what about the hill - entrance to property?? Locate the entrance at the border of the property – blind hill"</p>	<p>Response sent on January 4, 2011 stated "An entrance permit will be required for the Project. The proposed entrance will be designed in consultation with the municipality to ensure that the entrance will not impact traffic."</p> <p>Following this response, on February 9, 2011, Northland met with the individual who sent this email, to further discuss their concerns. The individual concerned appreciated Northland's efforts to consult with them. No further comments or concerns were raised during this meeting or since the date of this report.</p>
<p>Decommissioning</p>	<p>On August 26, 2010, an email was received with the following comment "After ? years and new technology has been produced, who will look after the clean up of this property, Many businesses start out strong but end up bankrupt.. What guarantee do we have.."</p>	<p>Response sent on January 4, 2011 stated "Northland is committed to the long-term operation, maintenance and eventual decommissioning of this Project. Northland will ensure that the site is decommissioned according to the Decommissioning Plan, a document which you can review along with all of the Project documentation"</p> <p>Following this response, on February 9, 2011, Northland met with the individual who sent this email, to further discuss their concerns. The individual concerned appreciated Northland's efforts to consult with them. No further comments or concerns were raised during this meeting or since the date of this report.</p>

<p>Compensation</p>	<p>On August 26, 2010, an email was received with the following comment "what compensation is there out there for us?"</p>	<p>Response sent on January 4, 2011 stated "No direct compensation is contemplated but Northland has a history of being a good neighbour and is involved in the communities in which it operates."</p> <p>Following this response, on February 9, 2011, Northland met with the individual who sent this email, to further discuss their concerns. The individual concerned appreciated Northland's efforts to consult with them. No further comments or concerns were raised during this meeting or since the date of this report.</p>
<p>Visual Impact</p>	<p>On August 26, 2010, an email was received with the following comment "locate as far as possible - need to plant 2 rows of pine trees about 6' in height and trees to be replaced if tree doesn't live"</p>	<p>Response sent on January 4, 2011 stated "As is shown in the layout contained in the Design and Operations Report, the Project has been set back from the roadway to the greatest extent possible in order to minimize the visual impact."</p> <p>Following this response, on February 9, 2011, Northland met with the individual who sent this email, to further discuss their concerns.. During the meeting Northland reviewed copies of the layout from the Construction Plan Report as well as a visual rendering of the Project. The individual concerned appreciated Northland's effort to construct the Project away from the roadside and the plan to mitigate the view by planting trees around the substation near the roadway. No further comments or concerns were raised during this meeting or since the date of this report.</p>

<p>Site Cleanliness</p>	<p>On August 26, 2010, an email was received with the following comment "Because of our world heritage, lets make it a show place not a dump.."</p>	<p>Response sent on January 4, 2011 stated "Northland Power is committed to ensuring that their Projects are constructed in accordance with all requirements. Environmental protection measures have been detailed within the various Renewable Energy Approval documents, which are available for your review."</p> <p>Following this response, on February 9, 2011, Northland met with the individual who sent this email, to further discuss their concerns. During the meeting Northland reviewed copies of the layout from the Construction Plan Report as well as a visual rendering of the project. The individual concerned appreciated Northland's effort to construct the project away from the roadside and the plan to mitigate the view by planting trees around the substation near the roadway. No further comments or concerns were raised during this meeting or since the date of this report.</p>
<p>Comment/Question Received during an in person meeting with a local resident on February 9th, 2011</p>		
<p>Noise</p>	<p>Concerned about noise during construction</p>	<p>Northland met with a local resident on February 9, 2011 to further discuss their concerns. During the meeting the local resident expressed concern for noise during construction. Northland expressed that it is committed to minimizing noise during construction and that construction hours will normally be from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, in accordance with local municipal by-laws.</p> <p>No further comments or concerns were raised during this meeting or since the date of this report. Northland will continue to communicate with the resident for how best to reduce the impact of noise during the construction period.</p>

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

Blank back

3. Consultation with Agencies

3.1 Agencies

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

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

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

3.1.1 *Ontario Ministry of Environment*

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

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

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

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

3.1.2 Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources

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

- On October 19, 2010, comments were provided to Hatch by MNR Kemptville, with a meeting to discuss the comments held on October 26, 2010 with representatives of Northland, Hatch, and MNR Kemptville.
- On November 2, 2010, at the request of MNR Kemptville, Hatch provided electronic copies of the text of the NHA reports to MNR Kemptville.
- On November 15, 2010, updated reports were provided to MNR Kemptville which addressed previous comments on the Natural Heritage reports.
- On November 19, 2010, MNR Kemptville provided additional comments on the Natural Heritage reports. Updated reports that addressed these comments were provided by Hatch to MNR Kemptville on November 29, 2010.
- On December 13, 2010, MNR Kemptville provided additional comments on the Natural Heritage reports. Updated reports that addressed these comments were provided by Hatch to MNR Kemptville on December 15, 2010.
- MNR Kemptville provided their confirmation letter of the Natural Heritage Reports on December 20, 2010.

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

3.1.3 Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture

- Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. (ARA) submitted an Archaeological Assessment Report entitled 'Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Rideau Lakes Solar Project' to the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture (MTC) on August 24, 2010. The Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report recommended that the locations with potential to be archaeological significant be subjected to a Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment.
- On September 24, 2010, the MTC responded that the archaeological assessment undertaken for the Project complies with the Ontario Heritage Act's licensing requirements, including the license terms and conditions and the Ministry's 1993 Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines. This letter is included in Appendix F.
- Following additional consultation with the MTC, including a meeting at the MTC's offices on October 12, 2010, the 'Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Rideau Lakes Solar Project' was revised such that the report recommended setbacks from that the locations with potential to be archaeological significant to ensure no impact on the potentially significant features. Therefore, the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report concluded that the locations with potential to be archaeological significant lie well away from lands and could be properly protected such that there would no further assessment required. A final revision of this report was re-submitted by ARA to the MTC on January 6th, 2011.
- On January 6, 2011, the MTC responded that the archaeological assessment undertaken for the Project complies with the Ontario Heritage Act's licensing requirements, including the license terms and conditions and the Ministry's 1993 Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines. This letter is included in Appendix F.

3.1.4 Rideau Valley Conservation Authority

- Hatch submitted a Property Inquiry request to the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority (CRCA) in June 2010 for information on natural heritage and water body features on or within 120 m of the Project location.
- A letter was sent to Hatch by the CRCA on June 30, 2010 in response to the Property Inquiry. The CRCA identified a Provincially Significant Wetland which occurs near the property, though not within 120 m of the Project location. The CRCA also identified that setbacks from watercourses, shorelines or wetlands do not extend onto the Project location.

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

3.1.5 United Counties of Leeds and Grenville

- On June 30, 2010, Hatch spoke with Sandy Hay, the county planner. Hatch described the Project location, and requested a meeting with Sandy Hay to discuss the Project further. The meeting request was declined. Hatch requested information relating to the County's interest in the Project. Sandy Hay indicated that their interests would solely consist of entrance permit requirements off of the County roads.
- On June 30, 2010 an email containing the municipal consultation form and Project Description Report was sent to the Clerk of the County of Leeds and Grenville, and copied to Sandy Hay.
- On July 20, 2010, the Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project and Public Meeting was sent to the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville. The Notice of Final Public Meeting was sent on January 4, 2011.
- On March 21, 2011, Hatch spoke with Les Sheppard (LS), Director of Works, Planning Services and Asset Management, to determine if there were any concerns identified with the Projects and to request the completed municipal consultation form. No concerns were identified, however LS asked that the form be sent again.
- Hatch e-mailed LS a copy of the municipal consultation form, as requested, on March 21, 2011.
- Completed municipal consultation forms were provided to Hatch on March 29, 2011. A copy of the form is included in Appendix G.

Appendix G contains any correspondence with the municipality.

3.1.6 Township of Rideau Lakes

- On January 21, 2010, representatives of Northland met with Sheldon Laidman (SL), Manager of Development Services. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce Northland to the local municipality and establish a working relationship. Topics discussed include the permitting process, local requirements, and interaction with the municipality during the development of the project.
- On June 15, 2010, representatives of Northland and Hatch met with SL. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the Township to the proposed Project and to further discuss requirements. The following items were discussed:

- ◆ Hatch requested information on locations of suitable halls within the township, and newspapers with general circulation. SL indicated that the Crosby Hall would be suitable, and that the Westport Review Mirror is the appropriate publication.
 - ◆ SL indicated that there is a fee for completion of the Municipal Consultation Form.
 - ◆ Hatch requested clarification as to whether a building permit would be required. SL indicated that they would be required for inverter stations of larger buildings.
 - ◆ SL indicated that a road entrance permit would not be required, as the Project is located on a County Road.
 - ◆ Hatch requested clarification as to whether there was a Tree Clearing By-law within the Township. SL indicated that there was no Tree Clearing By-law within either the Township or County.
 - ◆ Hatch requested information on natural heritage features and waterbodies. SL recommended contacting the MNR.
 - ◆ SL requested information on visual mitigation and fence design. Northland indicated that as the Project is still in a preliminary stage of design, no such information was available, however this information would be provided within the Design and Operations Report.
- On June 30, 2010 an email containing the municipal consultation form and Project Description Reports was sent to the Clerk of the Township of Rideau Lakes.
 - On July 5, 2010, SL responded to the submission advising Northland and Hatch of the fee for review of the municipal consultation form.
 - On July 20, 2010, the Notice of Proposal to Engage in a Renewable Energy Project and Public Meeting was sent to the Township of Rideau Lakes. The Notice of Final Public Meeting was sent on January 4, 2011.
 - On January 10, 2011, Hatch requested information on the municipal consultation form review fee, which was provided by SL in an e-mail on the same day. The fee applicable to projects greater than 10 MW is \$ 2,680.
 - On February 28, 2011, Hatch spoke with SL to determine if there were any concerns identified with the Project and to request the completed municipal consultation form. SL asked that the form be sent again.
 - As requested by the Township of Rideau Lakes, an electronic copy of the municipal consultation form was e-mailed to SL on February 28, 2011.
 - The completed Municipal Consultation Form was provided to Hatch by the Township on March 16, 2011. A copy of the form is included in Appendix G.

Appendix G contains any correspondence with the municipality.

3.1.7 Parks Canada

- In order to complete the heritage checklist as per the REA Regulation, correspondence with Parks Canada took place. Parks Canada requested that additional information be provided with

respect to the viewscape from the Rideau River to the Project location. Hatch provided the additional information, including photographs taken from the Rideau River aimed at the Project location, which adequately addressed Parks Canada concerns and they determined a heritage assessment was not required.

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

3.2 Agency Comments and Concerns

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

Table 3.1 Comments/Concern From Agencies and Responses

Agency	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
Ontario Ministry of the Environment	Request for baseline well water testing.	Northland has developed a "Baseline Well Water Monitoring Program and Construction Response Plan".
Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources	Various comments were provided regarding the Natural Heritage reports.	All comments were addressed by revising the Natural Heritage Reports.
Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture	In consultation with the MTC, it was recommended that the project proceed without further heritage concerns, as locations with potential to be archaeological significant lie well away from lands and can be properly protected.	None required.
Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority	No concerns identified	None required.
United Counties of Leeds and Grenville (UCLG)	It was noted through a conversation that UCLG's concerns would solely consist of entrance permit requirements off of County roads.	As the Project is not located on a County Road, there is no entrance permit required.
	UCLG has identified a need for an entrance permit.	Northland will work with UCLG to obtain an entrance permit for the Project.
	UCLG noted that CR-14 is subject to half-load restrictions. UCLG indicated that Northland will need to complete a condition survey pre- and post- construction and that Northland will be responsible for any repairs required.	Northland will comply with any half-load restrictions. Northland acknowledges that road maintenance will be required during the construction period to maintain local roadways in a serviceable manner consistent with current conditions. Northland agrees to complete conditions surveys pre- and post-construction.
Township of Rideau Lakes	Concerns with respect to traffic and servicing on Township roads, which are sub-standard for large construction	Northland is continuing to work with the Township to ensure that concerns regarding roadways are addressed.

Agency	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
	vehicles	Northland will work with the Township to ensure that transportation routes are identified in consideration of Township interests/requirements.
	<p>The Township expressed their interest to see and review a detailed a landscaping plan and its concern that the project be adequately screened from view, considering there is little to no natural vegetation to buffer the visual impact.</p> <p>The Township also expects that substations and permanent parking areas be screened from view landscaping or increased setbacks.</p> <p>Concerns about visual impact and the importance of proper landscaping and setbacks to maintain the rural appearance, considering that the site is a short distance from the Rideau Canal and the historic Narrows Lock Lock Station.</p>	<p>Northland has designed the Project such that all Project components, with the exception of the access road and transformer station, are well away from the road. In addition, trees are proposed for planting around the transformer station near the roadway. At this time, additional visual mitigation is not anticipated to be required, as feedback from local residents received at the Final Public Meeting was positive. Existing vegetation along the boundary of the property and within the setback from the roadways will be maintained throughout the life of the Project.</p> <p>Northland will continue to consult with the Township on the visual aspects of the Project. A landscaping plan will be provided if, after additional consultation, it is still desired.</p>
	The Township expects that all internal roads will be designed to allow emergency-vehicle access.	Northland will consult with the Fire Chief to ensure internal roadways are designed to permit emergency-vehicle access.
	The Township expressed its expectation that the new hydro connection lines be buried to lessen visual impacts and that the substation be moved further from the road to reduce visual impacts.	Northland will consider the Township's request that their connection from the transformer station to the distribution network along Narrows Lock Road be buried. The final determination as to whether this is possible will depend partially on site conditions (e.g., potential for shallow bedrock preventing burying of the line, etc.) and will follow additional consultation with the municipality.
	The Township commented that all temporary parking and staging areas be revegetated to the original condition following construction	As is described within the Construction Plan Report, temporary parking and laydown areas required during construction will be restored following the completion of construction.
	The Township will require building permits as needed under the OBC.	Northland will work with the Township to obtain any necessary permits required for the Project. Northland

Agency	Comment/Concern	Response: Mitigation, Resolution and/or Amendment to Project
		acknowledges that a Building Permit will be required.
	The Township will require building permits as needed under the OBC.	Northland will work with the Township to obtain any necessary permits required for the Project. Northland acknowledges that a Building Permit will be required.
	The Township requested baseline water testing of wells within 300 m of the property.	As is described within Section 3.1.1, Northland has consulted with the MOE to establish a baseline well water monitoring program that will establish baseline conditions for wells within 500 m of the Project location.
	The Township has requested that solar projects be setback from each residential lot line.	In order to provide setback from Narrows Lock Road, and residential dwellings along those boundaries, it is not possible to provide for further setbacks than those presently incorporated into the design. Currently, the Project is setback 30 m from the southern lot line, and 10 m from the northern and western lot lines.
	The Township requested that drilling and construction be conducted in accordance with the noise by-law	Northland will ensure that all construction activities are conducted in accordance with the local noise by-law. Further, Northland will work with the construction manager to ensure that all efforts are made to minimize the amount of noise disturbance emanating from the Project location during construction.
	The Township requested that no chemical weed control be used.	Northland has stated that hazardous chemicals will not be used for vegetation control.
Parks Canada	Concern that Project would affect viewscape from the Rideau River (Heritage River).	Hatch photographed views from the Rideau River to the Project location and provided a report to Parks Canada. Since it was determined that the Project would not impact the view from the Rideau River, Parks Canada responded that no further work or changes were required.

4. Consultation with Aboriginal Communities

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

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

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

4.1 Aboriginal Community Consultation List

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

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

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

4.2 Consultation Activities

4.2.1 First Public Meeting and Notice

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

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

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

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

4.2.2 Final Public Meeting and Notice

On January 4, 2011, after all Project documents were drafted and letters of confirmation were received from MNR and MTC, the Aboriginal communities on the MOE's list were sent summaries of all reports and copies of all Project Reports, as per the requirements of REA Regulation. A minor error was noted in the Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Report, therefore a revised Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Report and corresponding updated Executive Summary was sent out again to all the Aboriginal communities on the MOE's list on January 7, 2011.

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

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

4.3 Other Aboriginal Consultation Activities

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

The details of the communications and activities for each Aboriginal community are contained in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Details of Additional Consultation Activities

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

Community/Group	Details of Additional Consultation Activities
Hiawatha First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hatch contacted Diane Sheridan, Land Resource Worker, of the Hiawatha First Nation on January 24, 2011. Diana Sheridan confirmed that the reports had been received and indicated that she would provide comment. • On January 26, 2011, Diane Sheridan provided an email to Hatch indicating that the Hiawatha First Nation have no concerns at this time.
Curve Lake First Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northland/Hatch contacted the Curve Lake First Nation on November 29, 2010 and January 19, 2011. • On January 24, 2011, Tammy of the Curve Lake First Nation contacted Hatch, and she indicated that she would determine whether the reports had been received. • On February 3, 2011, Hatch contacted the Curve Lake First Nation, no response was provided. • On February 16, 2011, Hatch spoke again with Tammy of the Curve Lake First Nation. Tammy indicated that the information had been forwarded to the "Duty to Consult" group. • On March 29th, 2011, Hatch spoke with Tammy of the Curve Lake First Nation. Tammy indicated that Hatch should contact the Land Resource Consultation Workers • On March 30th, 2011, Hatch spoke with one of the Land Resource Consultation Workers. She indicated that a response would be coming shortly. • On March 31st, 2011, Hatch received a response from the Curve Lake First Nation. The response indicated that they were not aware of any issues that would cause concern with respect to the Traditional, Aboriginal or Treaty rights. The response also recommended contacting Karry Sandy-Mackenzie, Williams Treaty First Nation Claims Coordinator. • Northland has previously attempted to contact Karry Sandy-Mackenzie on January 11th and January 18th, 2011 in relation to the Project. No response has been received to date.
Kawartha Nishnawbe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northland/Hatch have made repeated efforts (2010: Nov. 29, Dec.13; 2011: Feb.3, Feb. 16, Mar. 4, Mar. 25) to contact the Kawartha Nishnawbe, with voice messages left for Chief Nahrgang.
Métis Nation of Ontario	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See consultation activities with James Wagar, Consultation Assessment Coordinator for the Métis Nation of Ontario below.

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

4.4 Aboriginal Comments and Concerns

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

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

Table 4.2 Comments/Concerns from Aboriginal Communities and Responses

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

5. Conclusions

Since May 2010, the consultation program for the Rideau Lakes Solar Project has been active. There has been open dialogue with the public, agencies, Aboriginal groups and the local municipalities regarding the Project. In addition to communications via email, letters, meetings and phone calls, there was an initial first public meeting, followed by a one to one meeting with a concerned resident on February 9th, and then more detailed final public meeting hosted by Northland to further encourage discussion and comment on the Project. The purpose of this Consultation Report is to ensure a transparent and meaningful consultation process for all participants with an interest in the Project, where all comments and questions received are documented, reviewed and addressed.

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

Blank back

6. References

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