Appendix G10

Public Correspondence

PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE

WOLFE ISLAND WIND PROJECT

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G10

File No. 160960180
06 November 2007

Prepared for:

Canadian Renewable Energy Corporation
a wholly owned subsidiary of Canadian Hydro Developers, Inc.
500-1324 17th Avenue SW
Calgary AB, T2T 5S8

Prepared by:

Stantec Consulting Ltd.
361 Southgate Drive
Guelph ON N1G 3M5

Last updated 02 November 2007

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G10
PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE

Table of Contents

1.0 NOTICE OF COMMENCEMENT TO RELEASE OF DRAFT EA 1
1.1 General Project Comments 1
1.1.1 Webmail Comments 1
1.1.2 Comments Received by Phone, Fax, and Mail 52
1.1.3 Comment Cards March 2006 Public Open House 95
1.1.4 Comment Cards January 2007 Community Meeting 116
1.1.5 Comment Cards March 2007 Public Open House 117

2.0 RELEASE OF DRAFT EA TO NOTICE OF COMPLETION 127
2.1 General Project Comments 127
2.1.1 Webmail Comments 127
2.1.2 Comments Received by Phone, Fax, and Mail 138
2.2 Comments on the Draft EA 160
2.2.1 Comments from Public 160
2.2.2 Comments from OMB Appellants and WIRE 261

List of Appendices

Appendix A Petitions

This page left blank intentionally.

1.0 Notice of Commencement to Release of Draft EA

1.1 GENERAL PROJECT COMMENTS

1.1.1 Webmail Comments

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
9-Aug-05	• Generally supports projects of this nature • Concerned that Study Area includes Lake Ontario Park • Suggests looking at Amherst Island rather than Wolfe Island, as it has similar wind fetch and access to the mainland to land power instead of through Kingston	11-Aug-05	• Assured that Lake Ontario Park is not being considered as part of the transmission line route. • Informed him that a wind power development has been considered for Amherst Island by GAIA Power Inc.
12-Aug-05	• Thanked for the previous response, feels more confident about the project and wishes us luck.		• No response required
10-Aug-05	• Thanked for the opportunity to comment on the project • Totally supports this initiative	11-Aug-05	• Thanked for comments
11-Aug-05	• Wants confirmation that his house is in the study area • Wants to know why his house would be within the study area (e.g. windmills in neighbours yard, power line on their street, or potential for noise etc)	12-Aug-05	• Explained study area includes all areas considered as possible transmission line routes, and no turbines will be located in Kingston. • Final transmission line route has not been decided, but it is NOT expected to go along Montgomery Blvd.
12-Aug-05	• Thanked for response • Still unclear as to why his neighbourhood is included in the study zone if transmission line is not going on their road	12-Aug-05	• Re-stated that the area in Kingston was looked at to find possible routes for the transmission line. Neighbourhood was investigated and therefore is in the study area, although very unlikely that final route will be chosen there.
20-Sep-05	• Generally support wind power projects • Concerned that wind power projects may proceed without necessary research • Do not support this project near their community • Cited several websites of other wind farms in Denmark,	18-Nov-05	• Thanked for the response • Concerns duly noted, rest assured that concerns from stakeholders are welcomed and considered with utmost diligence • Different countries and states have different guidelines, rules and restrictions related to wind power generation

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	Germany and Britain • Concerns include noise levels, flickering effects, proximity to populated areas, poor experiences of people in other countries.		• This particular project subject to rigorous screening process under Regulation 116, MOE noise guidelines, and CEAA • Experience gleaned from countries with a longer history of wind power generation are an immense resource, and additionally have helped accelerate advances in operation and design of modern turbines
See above	• Signed above letter	See above	• See above (copy of response sent)
27-Sep-05	• Supports alternative energy projects • Stressed that wind power developments must not impact the following areas: residential, hospitals, schools, public parks • Stressed that wind power projects must be financially viable apart from reasonable assistance from governments to support research • Concerned that study area includes residential areas, and that turbines are proposed for Lake Ontario Park (beside a residential neighbourhood, a hospital, and a college), and south of the Invista plant (also too close to residences, hospitals, etc)	5-Oct-05	• Assured him that all turbines will be on the island • Transmission line route will pass through portions of Kingston, but not through Lake Ontario Park.
11-Oct-05	• Concerned that turbines may end up located within the airport's outer surface (map of study area indicated this was possible) • Concerned that the AZRs do not permit a structure higher than 45m above the airport surface	N/A	• Canadian Hydro has been in contact by phone, therefore no written response.
8-Jan-06	• student in Co-op Civil Engineering program at Concordia University, Montreal. • Would like more information about the project, including start date and if there were opportunities for a work term in Fall 2006	6-Feb-06	• Thanked for interest in project • Provided info on project timing (i.e. currently preparing ESR, permitting and approvals in 2006, construction in 2007/2008) • Provided contact information for sending resume, will forward on to Canadian Hydro.
16-Feb-06	• Conducting a study with Queens University • Would like to know the model of wind turbine to be used	23-Feb-06	• Thanked for interest in the project • Provided info on the Siemens 2.3 MW Mark II model wind turbine, and provided link to Siemens website for further

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			information.
28-Feb-06	• Wanted to know about decibel levels of turbines in a strong wind	3-Mar-06	• Wind speeds increase revolution of turbine blades, which can increase sound • An Environmental Noise Impact Assessment will be undertaken
7-Mar-06	• Noted that Public Open House on March 23 conflicts with the City of Kingston monthly Planning Committee meeting • This causes conflict for many people with interest in environment and land use issues • Prevents more than half of City Council from attending	10-Mar-06	• There is an identical Public Open House on Wolfe Island the night beforehand, those interested can perhaps attend that one • Display boards from Open house will also be uploaded to project website • Asked if she could provide a schedule of the future Planning Committee meetings.
8-Mar-06	• Where are transmission lines coming ashore? • Where will there be underground cable? • Where will overhead line be strung? • How tall are steel or concrete monopoles? • Resident of neighbourhood adjacent to Sunny Acres, frequent user of park at bottom of Sunny Acres; wants to know impact on the park, if any, and whether or not the poles will be placed along Sunny Acres • If we're taking park land and putting big poles up on Sunny Acres, consultation with local stakeholders should be part of process • Isn't aware of any consultation to date	10-Mar-06	• Currently undergoing required environmental assessment processes, which includes stakeholder consultation • At the present time the power line corridor hasn't been finalized • Decision will be based on input from local stakeholders, environmental conditions, technical requirements, and engineering considerations • Looking to work with Invista to utilize their property rather than use the park/Sunny Acres Dr. • As part of future development, we'll be determining pole type, height, etc. • Invited to Public Open House, gave information
11-Mar-06	• Wolfe Island is a significant area for migrating waterfowl • Wolfe Island is the sporting destination for many traditional hunting and bird watching groups • Has consideration been given to possible impact on these migrating waterfowl? • Great numbers of waterfowl use island as a stop-over on spring and fall migrations	15-Mar-06	• Concerns duly noted • This project subject to rigorous screening process under Reg 116 and CEAA • We are aware that island is significant for waterfowl • Have accumulated much data and are working with government agencies, local wildlife groups, etc to obtain as much info as possible

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	• Island is in the confluence of two major flyways • Waterfowl add substantially to economic benefit of the island • Scientific research (other countries e.g. Netherlands) and the number of potential deaths are very high in migration areas. • Have any studies been done, or will they be done to gauge impact on birds? • Concerned about turbines scaring/disrupting waterfowl from feeding areas (especially Canada Geese and Mallards). • These birds use agricultural land on western end of island for feeding and resting during Sep-early Dec, as well as April.		• Have also reviewed previous studies from the area, and performed surveys as part of the study • Final results will be in the ESR • Average mortality rate of 1 – 2 birds per turbine per year with modern turbine design • A cat let out of the house will kill more birds • Canadian investigations of potential effects indicate that waterfowl avoid turbines, and that they increase flight altitude to avoid them. This study has been uploaded to project website. • Waterfowl feeding areas will be considered as part of the ESP, note that Canada Geese have been known to forage close to turbines
12-Mar-06	• Submitted resume	14-Mar-06	• Resume passed on to CHD for future consideration as the project evolves
12-Mar-06	• Has one acre property on Wolfe Island • Supports project for environmental/economic reasons • Concerned about property value (smaller pool of prospective purchasers) • Concerned that community will not be compensated appropriately – over and above government capped assessment • Concerned about effect of towers on communication signals • Concerned that towers will further degrade the night sky for star gazing	15-Mar-06	• Majority of literature from around world shows no effect on property value • Mentioned Melancthon study and its results • Gave link to property value studies on MG website • Gave list of benefits to community from project (employment, new source of taxation, royalty payments to landowners) • Interference with communication signals is rare, but will be part of ESP. • Are working with iSERV branch of government; they have no concern with the project so far • Turbine lighting and marking is responsibility of Transport Canada. Current guidelines indicate red flashing lights on some turbines
15-Mar-06	• Thanked for prompt reply • Based on experience in Melancthon Township, would like to know job descriptions for expected new positions	17-Mar-06	• Actual operation positions not yet determined • People with electrical and mechanical backgrounds are often considered

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	• On the board of the Frontenac CFDC, can help with training opportunities for residents in anticipation of these jobs		• There may also be a position for an office manager • St. Lawrence College is developing programs tailored to skills required by renewable energy, Queens University might be doing the same
14-Mar-06	• Interested in jobs from project; specifically instrumentation technician or operating engineer positions • Asked if there will be a main monitoring facility to control turbines	15-Mar-06	• There will be employment opportunities • Operation positions created will depend on many factors, but people with electrical and mechanical backgrounds are often considered • There will be an operations and maintenance building installed
14-Mar-06	• Landowner social: confusion of dates (Mar 22 is a Wed, invitation said Tues)	15-Mar-06	• Clarified date and time of landowner social, apologized for confusion
22-Mar-06	• Understood that the dates for the Open Houses had changed; wanted current information	27-Mar-06	• Not sure where uncertainty arose • Open houses went as posted in papers/website • Display boards will be posted
N/A	• N/A	28-Mar-06	• Further to our previous correspondence, we would like to add you to our project distribution list. If you could provide us with your mailing address, we will be sure that all future notices will be sent to you directly.
22-Mar-06	• Wanted to know how the power is going to be transmitted from each turbine to underwater cable to Gardiners Rd • Hopes for buried cable rather than unsightly overhead transmission lines	27-Mar-06	• Explained collector lines to Wolfe Island Transformer Station • Buried vs. overhead depends on many factors, such as depth to bedrock (explained that the island have shallow soils, by necessity will be overhead in these areas) • Explained route of mainland transmission line • Open house display boards on website, including power line route and portions underground/overhead
23-Mar-06	• Was unable to attend either open house • Would like to know changes planned for her neighbourhood (Reddendale & Henderson Place)	27-Mar-06	• Open house display boards will be available on website • Display boards include preliminary route for mainland transmission line

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
24-Mar-06	• Where are the bird studies available? • Where are studies about effects of turbulence and evaporation rates downwind from the proposed towers?	28-Mar-06	• We are still analyzing data from bird studies; the final results will be released with ESP • Gave info on modeling study from University of Calgary/Princeton re: climatic fluctuations due to turbines (none expected for this project)
25-Mar-06	• Open house very informative (she is optioned landowner) • Wolfe Island Women's Institute can provide refreshments for next meeting	27-Mar-06	• Will certainly contact Women's Institute about refreshments for future meetings • Asked for confirmation of contact information for the Women's Institute
28-Mar-06	• Confirmed contact information	N/A	• No response required
27-Mar-06	• Submitted resume	28-Mar-06	• Resume passed on to CHD for future consideration as the project evolves
27-Mar-06	• Submitted company information: commercial diving team	28-Mar-06	• Company information passed on to CHD for future consideration as the project evolves
28-Mar-06	• Extended an invitation to GreenUP! Festival, a festival celebrating nature • Indicated that the Wolfe Island Wind Farm Project will be a major issue at the event • If you could post a link to your website telling people information regarding the festival, it would be greatly appreciated.	29-Mar-06	• CREC staff are unavailable to attend on that weekend • Website manager is out of the office for the week, but perhaps in the future a "local links" section may be added.
29-Mar-06	• Is the 200MW power generation annual average or maximum output? • If it was average annually, his calculations presume energy would work out to be $0.76/kwH • If it was maximum output, what sort of rates would they be paying?	12-April-06	• 197.8MW is the maximum production capacity of the facility. • Total power production is estimated at 537,000 mwh per year (enough to power 75,000 households). • The turbines typically last about 30 years, at which point they can be repowered (new gearbox, etc.)
23-Mar-06	• There is a broken link on the project website • Wants to know if these reports are helpful or not and would love some feedback	6-April-06	• Information has been passed on to the appropriate people and we thank you for the information.

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	• If we would prefer not to be notified, Roy will not inform of problems again		
10-Apr-06	• Looking to gain some information on the employment aspect of the wind farm for local tradesmen like himself • Looking specifically for a contact name in regards to becoming a worker on this wind project.	12-Apr-06	• There will be both full time and part time employment opportunities created as a result of this project. • Construction will begin in 2007 • You can send your resume through this email or you can send it to Rob Nadolny. • Your resume will then be forwarded to Canadian Hydro Developers Inc.
25-Apr-06	• would like to offer his support for this project and believes that it will have a positive triple bottom line effect for Eastern Ontario. • The province and country need more energy	26-Apr-06	• Thank you for your interest and support. Your participation and feedback is an important part of the ESP. • As the project proceeds, we will notify you of any future stakeholder consultation activities.
01-May-06	• How close is Wolfe Island to hearing about or seeing the site plan for the proposed wind turbines?	03-May-06	• work to determine the appropriate turbine siting is presently underway. There are many factors that are critical to selecting • appropriate locations for wind turbines. Some of these include the availability of an adequate wind resource, environmental features, locations of houses and municipal infrastructure, and engineering considerations. • We expect to have a draft layout of the turbine siting late spring / early summer, in advance for the next round of Public Open Houses that are planned for the project. • If you would like to be placed on the mailing list, you can send us your contact information.
05-May-06	• As proprietors and residents of Wolfe Island, they are excited to welcome such a project. • This undertaking will require a community effort to accommodate the work force. • It would be their pleasures to help in any way they can. They have a restaurant that can accommodate 200 people, 9 hotel rooms and a furnished apartment	08-May-06	• Thank you for your interest in this project and for the information on your services. This information will be passed on to CREC for future consideration as the project progresses

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
30-May-06	• Wants to know about the studies on potential impacts to neotropical migratory birds and waterfowl, in view of the flyway	02-Jun-06	• The ESP has not been completed, but we are aware that it is an IBA for waterfowl and that raptors use the area • We are working with local wildlife groups, Canadian Wildlife Services, Environment Canada, residents and other stakeholders. • Detailed reviews of previous studies and waterfowl surveys have been conducted and are being analyzed. The results will be presented in the ESR, which will be made available to the public later this year. • Additional information can be found on the website, or you can contact us with webmail. • Rob Nadolny's contact info.
13-Jun-2006	• I am an MPA student working on a paper regarding Wolfe Island. I am wondering if the • Feasibility Study of this project is available because • I need some information for my paper, such as • financial analysis and the social impact on local • residents.	19-Jun-2006	• The ERR is currently being developed and will be available for stakeholder review later this year. • In the meantime, local project benefits to the community are anticipated and include: -creation of jobs during construction, as well as full and part time jobs during operation - Money spent locally on construction goods etc. - a new source of taxation for the Township -increase in the municipal budget -royalty payments to existing landowners who are likely to spend money in local community Additionally financial information regarding Canadian Hydro Developers Inc. can be found at: http://www.canhydro.com/www2005/investor_releases.htm
03-Aug-2006	• Student at the University of Guelph requesting information regarding the impact of the wind farm on the community as	15-Aug-2006	• Thank you for your interest in the project. The ERR for this project will be available for review later on this year on the project

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	a whole (business opportunities, positive compensation, etc.)		website. • Local benefits to the community from this windfarm include: The creation of jobs, monies being spent locally, full and part time employment opportunities, etc. • If you have any other questions, please feel free to contact us again.
18-Aug-2006	• Own a lot on the southern side of Reed's Bay • What parcels of land are you looking to locate the turbines?	22-Aug-2006	• work to determine the appropriate turbine siting is presently underway. There are many factors that are critical to selecting • appropriate locations for wind turbines. Some of these include the availability of an adequate wind resource, environmental features, locations of houses and municipal infrastructure, and engineering considerations. • We expect to have a draft layout of the turbine siting late summer / early fall, in advance for the next round of Public Open Houses that are planned for the project. • If you would like to be placed on the mailing list, you can send us your contact information.
24-Aug-2006	• I would like to learn more about this project • If there are any documents or information you can send me, it would be appreciated. • Alternatively, if there is a resource that has information about the project, you could provide that to me instead. • I would like to be placed on a mailing list for this project and be notified of any public information centres	24-Aug-2006	• Thank you for your interest in the project. • The project website has information regarding this project, including the Environmental Overview Report, and can be accessed at www.wolfeislandwind.com. • If you provide us with your mailing address, we will add you to our stakeholder mailing list and ensure that you are notified of future stakeholder consultation activities. • If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.
August 29, 2006	• Our company has a long history of submarine cable installation. • Please see attached brochure regarding services • We would be happy to provide pricing on your request	August 29, 2006	• Thank you for your interest in the project • Your information has been passed on to Canadian Hydro c/o Geoff Carnegie • If you have any questions of comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
Sept 12, 2006	• I have worked with Ian Baines of CREC in the past and would like to discuss the Wolfe Island Wind project. • I currently work with Skyward towers and am interested in discussing the future of the Wolfe Island Wind Project	Sept 12, 2006	• Thank you for your interest in the Wolfe Island Wind Project. Your information has been passed on to Geoff Carnegie at Canadian Hydro.
Oct. 16, 2006	• I am in the process of moving from Calgary to Kingston and am negotiating the purchase of property • I am concerned about the transmission line routing on the mainland and would like a drawing that documents the transmission line location. • This may nullify the real estate transaction.	Oct 17, 2006	• Thank you for you interest in the Wolfe Island Wind Project. • You can find a map of the preliminary preferred route of the transmission line on the website • Please note that this route is preliminary and minor modifications may be made. • If you have any other questions or comments contact us through email again or with contact information provided. •
Nov. 03, 2006	• I am writing a research paper on wind power and was wondering if you had some information you could send me	Nov 6, 2006	• Thank you for your interest in the project. • There is some information on wind power on our project website at www.wolfeislandwind.com • There is also some information on the CanWEA website • If you have any other questions, please contact Kara Hearne
Nov. 22 2006	• Wondering whether the project involves Simcoe Island • Are under the impression that the turbines would only be going up on Wolfe Island	Nov. 22, 06	• Thank you for your interest in the project • Simcoe Island is included in the study area so environmental effects on Simcoe Island will be investigated; however, turbines will NOT be sited on Simcoe Island.
Nov. 28, 2006	• student at Loyalist Collegiate and Vocational Institute in grade 11 Biology • assigned a project on a local issue • was wondering how efficient the wind turbines will be for Kingston and how much money citizens would get	Jan. 16 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the project • Local project benefits include creation of jobs, money spent locally, new sources of taxation for townships, increase in municipal budget, royalty payments for landowners. • For information on wind energy efficiency please refer to the CanWEA website. • If you have any other questions, please do not hesitate to contact us again.
Dec. 25	• I heard rumours regarding the cancellation of this project.	Jan 16.	• Thank you for your interest in and support of the project.

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
2006	• I hope this is not true and would love to hear an update of the project's progress	2007	• CREC is finalizing the turbine layout and Stantec is currently preparing the draft ERR. A Public Open House is anticipated for the end of February. If you provide us with your contact information, we will add you to our mailing list so you will be notified of these future stakeholder activities • If you have any other questions, please do not hesitate to contact us again.
Jan 15 2007	• The project website hasn't been updated in a while • Can you tell the progress of the project	Jan 16 2007	• Thank you for your interest in and support of the project. • CREC is finalizing the turbine layout and Stantec is currently preparing the draft ERR. A Public Open House is anticipated for the end of February. If you provide us with your contact information, we will add you to our mailing list so you will be notified of these future stakeholder activities • If you have any other questions, please do not hesitate to contact us again.
Jan 17 2007	• Provided contact information to be notified of future stakeholder activities	N/A	• No response required
Jan 17 2007	• Thanked Stantec for response and all the work needed to make this project happen	N/A	• No response required
Feb 14, 2007	• FYI and consideration: there are currently a pair of bald eagles and their offspring living in the woods enroute to Horne's Ferry. In addition to the trumpet swans mentioned earlier, these birds should be given mention and consideration in the ESR. thank you.	Feb 19, 2007	• Stantec undertook winter, spring and breeding avian surveys to assess the presence and abundance of avian fauna in the study area. • The purpose for this was to help establish the environmental baseline conditions and to identify potential impacts to birds arising from the proposed Project • Finding from work will be presented in ERR
March 12/07	• Owns land on Wolfe Island • Wants to start building a retirement home • Were not originally concerned about the project because they were told the turbines would be located on a peninsula • They have been informed that the turbines will now the	March 26, 2007	• We are in receipt of your email and voice message, which outlines your inertest in the Project • We understand from reading your email that you have the following four key concerns: turbine layout, municipal and

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	dotted around the island, and that access roads will be necessary for each turbine • Requested a turbine location plan from Township, understands that two turbines will be located within walking distance of her • Looked up wind farms on the internet and found there to be a lot of controversy, for good reason • Had previously signed a petition regarding setback issues, since project does not use experience from previous projects • It seems that blade size and configuration are factors in determining amount of potential noise • Has been told that the project will be using bigger turbines – why? • The Island's allure to her is that it is quiet • It would be such a cruel shame if the island becomes the equivalent of an industrial park • Also objects to artificial light that will be generated throughout the island • Thinking of delaying building until wind farm is abandoned or in place		environmental turbine setbacks, environmental noise, turbine lighting • In response to your queries the information below is provided • Based upon the current layout – the closest proposed turbine to your property is approximately 1.5 km away • Turbine layout: 86 turbines planned for the Project will be placed throughout the western portion of Wolfe Island • Access roads associated with the turbines will be located on lands owned by participating landowners, and will be sited in consultation with those landowners • Proposed turbines are new, 2.3 MW generators. These are a modern design that reduces or eliminates many of the concerns associated with older models of turbines, as you described in your correspondence • Municipal and Environmental Turbine Setbacks: Township of Frontenac Islands has completed the public process of approving an Official Plan Amendment (OPA) and Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBL) for the Project – these documents are attached for your reference • The ZBL distinguishes between lands where the owner has agreed to host wind plan infrastructure by signing an option agreement with CREC, defined as a 'participating' landowner, and those who have not agreed to host wind plant infrastructure, defined as 'non-participating' landowner • Property of participating landowners is referred to as a WP Zone in the ZBL – map of WP Zone is attached in the ZBL

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			• ZBL specifies that the minimum setback distance of a wind turbines from lands in any zone other than a WP Zone or Village Residential zone (Marysville) is the length of blade (45 metres) plus 4 metres. • Important to note that the ZBL setbacks represent minimum that will be applied to the Project • Other environmental factors, such as MOE environmental noise guidelines, as well as setbacks to wetlands and watercourses, can combine to result in greater sertbacks • Environmental Noise: MOE requires the Project demonstrate compliance with its environmental noise guidelines (Interpretation for Applying NPC Technical Publications to Wind Turbine Generators) • This guideline indicates that for wind speeds 6 m/s or less, in a Rural Area during the nighttime, sound levels at receptors should be 40 dB(A) or the minimum background sound level established pre-project, whichever is higher • To demonstrate compliance with these requirements, an Environmental Noise Impact Assessment (ENIA) has been prepared for the Project • The ENIA will assess the potential effects of the Project on environmental noise levels at receptors, the MOE defines residential dwellings or residences as receptors • CREC must comply with all regulatory requirements. Consistent with the MOE's review process, the ENIA is currently undergoing MOE technical review, which is preferred prior to its inclusion in the ERR.

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			• Turbine Lighting: Transport Canada – Aviation (TC) is the federal agency responsible for wind turbine lighting and marking requirements • The Project must comply with the aviation safety lighting and marking standards specified by TC as set out in the Canadian Aviation Regulations and Standards • TC has been developing new standards for wind turbines and has asked project developers to consider the new draft standards in their project planning • Based on the current standards, CREC expected only 31 of the 83 turbines may require an aviation safety light on top of the tower • Final determination will be made by TC • Regardless of the final number of turbines requiring lighting, CREC synchronize all lights to flash simultaneously to avoid the potential for a strobing effect • Upcoming Open House: attached for your information is the notice for the upcoming Public Open Houses for the Project.
March 13/07	• when will environmental assessment be completed and available to general public • is there a possibility that the project will not move forward if serious issues emerge from the EA?	March 14 2007	• ERR should be available mid May • The project cannot proceed until the ERR has been approved by the MOW • The MOE considers feedback from both agencies and stakeholders in their review process • Members of the public with any outstanding environmental concerns regarding a project undergoing the screening process should bring their concerns to the attention of CREC as early in the process as possible • Ensures that concerns can be considered during the preparation

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			of the ERR • If upon review of the ERR during the 30 day review period, it has been determined that these concerns have not been resolved, the concerned party may write to the Director of Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch at the MOE to request that the project be elevated to an individual EA • If one or more requests for elevation of the project are received within the 30 day review period by the Director of EAAB, the project cannot proceed until the Director makes a decision on the requests for elevation
March 13/07	• does not live on Wolfe Island, but supports any project which uses elements to enhance resources • knows the project is a good initiative • has trouble understanding selfish people with little or no vision who have had a privileged lifestyle (living on WI) that is denied the rest of us • do the people on WI believe they are not part of the environmental problem? • Supports the project, would support the project if it were in her backyard, in face, if you wish to put generator in my backyard, I welcome it, I get lots of wind	March 15 2007	• Thank you for interest in and support of WI wind project • Electricity produced from renewable sources has many benefits and we are proud to bring such a facility to WI • Your participation and feedback is an important part of the Environmental Screening process • Additional information can be found on the Project's website
March 13/07	• submit that all transmission wires must go underground • argument used by proponent that fracturing rock would cause problems with underground drainage, well damage etc. is not substantiated, it is only to avoid extra cost • if this project goes ahead, must be done in a way that creates the fewest impacts	March 13/07	• CREC is planning to install all electrical collector lines on WI underground • Additionally, the 23kV transmission line connecting the WI transformer station to the submarine cables, and the transmission line I the City, will also be underground. Above ground collector lines will only be used on WI where burying them is technically challenging or unfeasible • Site-specific conditions along the collector line routes will be evaluated at the time of construction, if blasting is feasible at certain locations, it may be considered

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			• Blasting activities involve the requirement for several permits and approvals and are typically only considered under a certain set of conditions • Although CREC is endeavoring to place all collector lines below ground, in areas where underground lines are not feasible, above ground lines will be installed on poles similar to what exists on the Island at present time
March 13, 2007	• member of The Consumer's Council of Canada, energy committee. Council welcomes the initiative of CREC, • Consumer support of project is essential, consumers must have access to all facts and data known to CREC • Flyer in mailbox says the project will generate approximately 198 megawatts, this is nameplate capacity of the 86 wind turbines • Website estimates that 537 000 megawatt hours will actually be generated, about 30% of the name plate capacity • The flyer is disingenuous and potentially misleading • Website gives an estimate of $2.4 million of revenue accruing to WI residents, where these appear in total power rates, do they apply to WI residents or do they appear in provincial rates? • CREC has negotiated a renewable energy supply contract, what are terms and conditions of this agreement, how much does CREC get for its power, how much will consumers be paying? • A substantive response to these issues is necessary for an informed discussion at any meeting.	March 16/07	• Thank you for pointing out nameplate capacity issue – we will correct this • All of details pertaining to renewable energy supply contacts and renewable energy requests for proposals are on the Ontario Power Authority's website • OPA will not release individual contract details • The ISEO buys and sells power, their website has historical data and power price records • Ontario's electricity pricing is volatile, and the price is expected to rise in the future – we believe a benefit of wind power is that it provides stable long term pricing • We have signed a contract with OPA that is essentially fixed
March 25, 2007	• Is it not true that there would be no windmills except for government subsidies? • Turbines break even at 10 years, right? Just when they break down and need to be replaced?	April 23, 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the Project. Your participation and feedback is an important part of the ESP • In response to your questions, the following information is provided:

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	• Bright light on top of a communication tower in Gananoque, do you plan one of these on top of 80 plus turbines? • Why are you not pushing for nuclear power instead?		• Project Economics: Wind energy provides stable, long-term fixed pricing - is not subject to fuel price volatility • Wind energy is price competitive today, when compared to other forms of new generation and the expected life of wind turbines exceeds 25 years • CHD is publicly traded company - has been in the business of generating electricity from renewable energy sources for nearly two decades • CHD strives to attain a return on average capital employed in the 10-12% range, resulting in a payback on projects in the order of ten years - Provided CHD website • Policy Support : Government of Canada outlined an evolving policy framework for honouring international environmental commitments and for fostering the development of renewable energy sources such as wind • Canadian government initiated these activities as a matter of good public policy that serves to better the environment and enhance the lives of Canadians - Provided NRCan's website for access to information • Turbine Lighting: Transport Canada – Aviation ("TC") is federal agency responsible for wind turbine lighting/marking requirements • The Project must comply with the aviation safety lighting and marking standards specified by TC - set out in *Canadian Aviation Regulations and Standards* • Based on current draft standards - expected that only 32 of the 86 turbines may require an aviation safety light on top of the tower - TC will make the final determination • Regardless of the final number of turbines requiring lighting, all lights will be synchronized to flash simultaneously to avoid the potential for a strobing effect

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			• Additional information will be provided on Project website as it becomes available
March 26, 2007	• The one word of warning that I can convey from speaking to people in the area of these projects is that birds do tend to fly into the windmills causing severe injury and death in most cases. • Before proceeding with your project - care must be given to avoid placing the devices where they will interfere with migratory routes of birds as this has had severe impact on such routes in these other instances.	May 1, 2007	• With regards to your comments, a comprehensive bird-monitoring program has been developed and implemented using guidance from Environment Canada/Canadian Wildlife Service. The Bird studies conducted for the project include: habitat surveys, wintering raptors, spring waterfowl, spring migration, fall migration, breeding birds, and species at risk. These avian surveys have been ongoing on Wolfe Island since 2002. The results of the monitoring program and surveys will be made available within the Environmental Review Report (ERR). • On average, the wind industry is finding an average mortality rate of one to two birds per turbine per year – put another way, a domestic cat that roams outside is likely to kill more birds in a year than a wind turbine. Additionally, human-made structures such as buildings and windows, communications towers, and cars collectively cause annual mortality rates in the millions.
March 26, 2007	• thank you for mailing me the notice of Environmental Review and POH • I am no longer on the executive, I would ask that you change your records to show Evan Walmsley as the KBA contact – Evan is currently the president	May 1, 2007	• Thank you for your email regarding contact points for the KBA • We have updated our records to show Evan Walmsley as the main KBA contact
March 27, 2007	• The link for the Open House on Mar. 27 and 28 is corrupted. Please advise time and locations of the Open House	April 10, 2007	• Thank you for interest in WI wind project • I hope you were able to make it to the POH • All of the information presented at the POHs are now available on the project website • (Provides link)
March 28, 2007	• Resume and cover letter attached for a volunteer position • Attachments do not open.	April 10, 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the Wolfe Island Wind Project. • Can you please re-send your attachments in Microsoft Word

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			format? I was unable to open them. Once I receive your attachment, they will be forwarded on to Canadian Hydro for their consideration.
March 28, 2007	• I'm planning to attend tonight's presentation, but I'm just wondering what the format is • is it a drop-in sort of thing or are there speakers? Is there an agenda available?		• Email not received until after POH, no response required
March 28, 2007	• at POH a representative of CREC said that it the Project would proceed with the transmission lines from wind towers going underground unless was not feasible. He also indicated that this would be a condition of the Project's approval. Please explain on which approval and from which ministry or agency this condition could be imposed • please explain on what basis the decision to not proceed with transmission lines underground will be made • Please explain how it is proposed that the estimated 200 construction workers will commute to the Island each day. Is it expected that some or most of them will bring their vehicles back and forth on the ferry? If your answer is no, how will this be ensured/enforced • how CREC will manage and respond to complaints received during the construction and during the operation of the wind farm • advise whether a second phase of the Wolfe Island Wind Farm is proposed and, if so, what the phase involves in terms of proposed location and number of windmills and timing of that phase	June 6, 2007	• Thank you for your comments resulting from the POHs for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, held on March 27 and 28, 2007 - Provided link to Project's website and direct link to POH panels • Due to high level of community interest CREC has made the harmonized EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA - beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP - Provided locations where EA is available for viewing • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence: Ferry Traffic, Permits and Approvals, Transmission Lines, Decommissioning • Future Phases of Project – there is no proposed or planned second phase of the Wolfe Island Wind Project. • As the Wolfe Island Wind Project proceeds, we will notify you of future activities • In the meantime, if you have any questions or comments with regards to the DRAFT EA or the Project in general, feel free to contact us directly • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before **4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007**.

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
Conversation with Geoff Carnegie at POH	• thinks WTG 81 is too close to the northern property boundary and should be relocated deeper into the participating property owner's property – he has a pond in the back corner of his abutting property where they like to duck hunt	22 May 2007	• thank you for your interest in the WI wind project • all information presented at POH is now available on project website • siting turbines is a balancing task, considering many factors such as: available/participating land base, wind speed and direction, environmental features (woodlands and watercourses), municipal requirements(setbacks to property lines and roads) and environmental noise. • We have evaluated your request for a potential shift of wind turbine #81, proposed to be located south of your property. Due to potential for increased environmental noise levels at non-participating residences, above those permitted by the MOE, along with consideration of wind direction and turbines spacing, we are unable to relocate this turbines. • Potential effects from the Project on waterfowl are being assessed as part of ESP • Data analysis is currently ongoing, in conjunction with EC and CWS, the final results will be presented in the ERR
March 29, 2007	• As a frequent visitor to Wolfe Island, I am opposed to your wind • turbines for its impact on birds and other wildlife, to say nothing of • the ruination of the Island's bucolia.	May 30, 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the Project. Your participation and feedback is an important part of the ESP –provided link to Project website and direct link to POH Panels • comprehensive bird-monitoring program has been developed and implemented using guidance from Environment Canada/Canadian Wildlife Service - bird studies include: habitat surveys, wintering raptors, spring waterfowl, spring migration, fall migration, breeding birds, and species at risk • avian surveys have been ongoing on Wolfe Island since 2004 - additional studies and surveys were conducted to assess the potential effects on other wildlife and wildlife habitat within the study area, including: amphibians and reptiles, bats, butterflies, fish and fish habitat, mammals and winter wildlife, and terrestrial,

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			wetland, and aquatic resources • results of the bird monitoring program, surveys and additional studies will be made available within the Environmental Review Report ("ERR") being prepared for the Project. The ERR is anticipated to be released for a 30-day stakeholder review and comment period in summer 2007 • modern wind turbines are large and visible structures, and therefore will create a change to the current Wolfe Island landscape -to help stakeholders better envision what the operating Project may look like, a Visual Change Assessment was undertaken for the ERR - some of the visual simulations were presented at the March 2007 Public Open House, and can be viewed on the project website. However, whether the visual change is positive or negative is a subjective opinion • Additional information about the Wolfe Island Wind Project will be provided on the project website as it becomes available
March 29, 2007	• one wetlands wasn't identified on the map presented at the open house; two towers and road access do appear on the maps. The Ministry of Natural Resources in conjunction with the landowner had developed a plan for re-habilitating the site. • I did not see illustrations of the proposed transmission/collector towers - this would be important information for residents of the island (especially those with homes near the northwest corner and transformer station) to view. • A pair of bald eagles have recently been spotted in a forest stand near Button Bay. Displacement of endangered species due to human activity, infrastructure and noise is a concern.	May 24, 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the Project. Your participation and feedback is an important part of the ESP –provided link to Project website and direct link to POH Panels • In response to the comments you submitted via webmail to project representatives, the following information is provided: • Unidentified Wetland Area: MNR provides mapping data regarding natural features within the study area including Provincially Significant Wetlands, Non-provincially Significant Wetlands and unevaluated wetlands - greatly appreciate any assistance you can provide in identifying the location of this wetland - attached the Overall Project Layout display board presented at the Public Open House - If you could show us the location on the map through email, fax, or verbally by telephone, it would be greatly appreciated. This will enable us to look into

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	• Is payment of amenities agreement income contingent upon the municipality amending the setback bylaw? • in favour of wind energy, however, I feel the concentration/siting of these large windmills is unfortunate • I was disappointed that the environmental assessment report was not available. When is this expected to be released		this issue further. Contact information is found below • Transmission Lines: CREC is planning to install all electrical collector lines on Wolfe Island underground • the 230 kV transmission line connecting the Wolfe Island Transformer Station to the submarine cable, and the transmission line in the City of Kingston, will also be placed underground - as a result, no illustrations are required, as the transmission lines will not be visible during operation • CREC is endeavouring to place all the collector lines on Wolfe Island below ground, in areas where underground lines are not feasible (e.g., soil depth is too shallow), the above ground collector lines will be installed on poles similar to what currently exist on the Island • Bald Eagles: comprehensive bird-monitoring program has been developed and implemented using guidance from Environment Canada/Canadian Wildlife Service - bird studies include: habitat surveys, wintering raptors, spring waterfowl, spring migration, fall migration, breeding birds, and species at risk • results of the bird monitoring program, surveys and additional studies will be made available within the Environmental Review Report ("ERR") being prepared for the Project. The ERR is anticipated to be released for a 30-day stakeholder review and comment period in summer 2007 • Amenities Agreement: CEC is investing approximately $410 million to construct and operate the Project, with numerous economic benefits to the community • Local benefits to the community will include, among others: the creation of jobs; monies spent locally (estimated $64 million during construction); a new source of taxation for the Township (estimated $550,000/year paid by CREC); royalty payments made to participating landowners (estimated $1.2 million/year),

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			and an Amenities Agreement with the Township for community betterment initiatives ($645,000/year) • Amenities Agreement is not contingent on the Township amending the setback bylaw as the zoning by-law amendement has already been approved by the Township • ERR: anticipated to be released for a 30-day stakeholder review and comment period during summer 2007
March 29, 2007	• Concerned about location of 7 turbines near where they are planning on building a house • Would like a copy of ESP, and was not able to find official site plan • a. concerned about noise levels , her area is zoned ' limited use residential, does this mean she will be treated differently regarding setbacks? • b. Concerned about strobe lighting that will be used on outside turbine across from their property and attraction this will have on bats to light in area: increase in bat fatality, as well as increase in bat population and resulting health impacts from bats, and flashing strobe light • c. Effects of sonic vibration on residents, have there been studies to determine this effect on people in the area • d. Concerned that combined number of turbines will exceed 40dbs • e. Will mechanical generators for WI also be buried underground? Has MOE upgraded their standards to meet compliance that incorporates both mechanical noise, as well as turbine wind noise • f. Concerned about burying the devices and effects on wells, given that water tables are so high, • g. Concerned with impacts on local ferry • h. Impact on property value • i. Lack of clear information and available material on the	April 2, 2007	• Thank you for your comments on the WI Wind Project • We have received many comments as a result of hosting the Public Open Houses • Responding to each individual will take some time • We are hoping to provide formal responses to each individual within the next few weeks • Stantec responded with written letter on May 1, 2007-10-03 • apologize for the delay in our response- as we mentioned in our emails dated April 2nd and April 18th, 2007, we have received a large volume of comments from the Public Open Houses • In response to your comments and to assist in shaping the context of our response - would first like to clarify three key items: 1. The wind turbine generators are above ground structures and will not be buried - what is proposed to be buried are the power line cables that connect the wind turbine generators to the electrical substation and then the provincial grid (i.e., the system by which the province transmits and distributes electricity to consumers). 2. This project's consultation process has been ongoing since 2004 and has remained and continues to be open for stakeholder input and is transparent in terms of the process implemented.

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	stage of the project, impacts, and solutions was not part of the POH's • Would like to know if ESP has investigated/researched these impacts and what the mitigating solutions will be • Would like to receive written documentation to support studies conducted • Please indicated which stage of the project we are • When will this information be available		3. Responses to stakeholder questions and comments are provided directly to the commenting stakeholder as well as summarized in the Environmental Review Report ("ERR") - this report is anticipated to be released for public review and comment during the summer of 2007. • Regarding your specific comments, we provide the following information:Obtaining Documents and Project Status On the project website (provides link), you will find all the display boards from the public open houses - one board of which contains the project layout (provides direct link) • Official Plan-as approved by the Township Council and Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, available on the project website(provides direct link) • Site Plans are documents that are required to be filed with the Township as part of their approvals process -the Project is not yet at this stage. Once the Site Plans are filed, will be available at Township office for review by Islanders and other stakeholders • As indicated on the display board "What is an Environmental Review" (provides direct link) we are in the process of preparing the ERR. This includes the review and evaluation of literature and other sources of data, field work, technical studies that examine a host of issues, stakeholder comments, etc. • next step in the ESP is integration of these results into the ERR enroute to releasing the document for its 30-day stakeholder review period- anticipated that the ERR will be released in the summer of 2007. • Environmental Noise**:** ENIA is being prepared for the Project - assessment is reviewed by technical staff at MOE to ensure that the Project is in compliance with the MOE's requirements

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			and within predicted sound level limits • In preparing this assessment we have conservatively assumed all areas within the wind plant siting area are "Rural" as defined by the MOE. The MOE's guidelines for this Rural (Class 3) classification note that a total nighttime (i.e., 7:00 pm to 7:00 am) sound level of 40 dB(A) or less is permissible: (provides link) • Regardless of the number of turbines, MOE's guidelines must be met - combined sound level from multiple turbines at a residence must meet this guideline • ENIA will be included within the ERR and available for public review and comment. The project will meet the applicable MOE guidelines for environmental noise from wind turbines. • Turbine Lighting**:** aeronautical safety lighting to which you refer are required and controlled by Transport Canada. In order to minimize any effect the required safety lights may have, CREC will use a Light-Emitting-Diode ("LED") style of light - has a slower on-off ratio (fades in and out) versus abruptly blinking on and off like the older Xenon lights that have been used in the past by many cell towers. • LED light softer in glow in comparison to the Xenon lights-CREC will synchronize the aeronautical safety lights to flash simultaneously to avoid what is termed "the strobing affect" • All lights will be in compliance with requirements of TC and to greatest extent possible number of lights required will be minimized • Based upon CREC's present understanding of TC's Draft 9 guidelines, 32 of the 86 wind turbines will require aviation safety lights-Provided link to corresponding display board and TC guideline • Vibrations**:** turbines are specifically designed to minimize

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			vibrations to the surrounding area -turbine blades are matched weighted - Sensors within the wind turbine monitor weighting, if they detect a noticeable change in the weighting, t turbine shuts down for inspection and/or until the proper weighting is achieved • Electrical Substation: In letter you state Mr. Scott Hossie made comment regarding previous Canadian Hydro project in which noise produced by mechanical generators and turbines resulted in need to bury generators and install buffers around generators - To clarify, comment was made in relation to existing transformer at Melancthon Wind Plant, not wind turbine generators • Following installation, transformer was thought to have times of possible exceedance of the MOE environmental noise guidelines - in response to comments received from nearby residences, an acoustical barrier wall (similar to those along highways) was constructed to assist in reducing the sound emissions • Building upon past experience, CREC has included acoustical barrier walls around the transformer for the Wolfe Island Wind Project- transformer station is being built slightly below grade to provide additional attenuation of sound emissions from this electrical substation • Water Wells: burying the electrical cables is not expected to affect water quality or quantity as cables are typically buried to a depth of about 1.5 metres, each cable is encased with its own protective sheath, no water is withdrawn as part of their operation • Ferry Management: ferry traffic study being completed as part of ESP- study based upon usage data supplied by MTO. Once data has been analyzed, stakeholder comments

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			considered, and various options evaluated, a final determination will be made with respect to the best available method for the transportation of construction personnel • Property Value**:** Based upon data reviewed to date in other areas with established wind plants (e.g., Canada, USA, Europe, and Australia), no material adverse effect to property values is anticipated as result project. CREC commissioned a property value review for Wolfe Island This information / study will be included in the ERR. At this time, CREC has no plans for compensation in this regard-Provided links to property value studies • Regulatory Requirements**:** project will fulfill (meet or exceed) all applicable regulatory requirements • Number of Turbines**:** correct that an approved Environmental Screening Report for a 24 MW project was completed in 2004 by CREC. Since that time, CREC has consolidated both the CREC and Gaia Power Inc. land options to form the present project; effects evaluation of which will be documented in the ERR.
March 29, 2007	• Thank you for providing for me opportunity to comment on this important issue • Increased use of renewable energy projects are critical at this point (I have installed a photovoltaic system at home to do my part) it is important not to rush into one form thinking it a panacea. We have done this with recycling…and are now seeing an increased consumerism and a 'disposable' mentality • Especially concerned re: health effects, generous amount of maintenance compared with solar applications • Was development of solar farms considered, or 'run of the river' turbines – let's do our homework on all of the options	May 1, 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the project • Provided link to project website and pubic open house panels • Potential health effects associated with the project are being thoroughly assessed as part of the ERR, which will be available for stakeholder review in the summer of 2007 • Canadian Hydro is a publicly traded company that has been in the business of generating electricity from renewable energy sources for nearly two decades • The WI area is home to a significant wind resource. The project is a private development by the CREC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Canadian Hydro and all associated economic risks are the sole responsibility of CREC

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	if it has not been done • Would have to see us invest $410 million dollars into something that will surely provide a great deal of electricity for this area but that may also create health issues and unintended costs as well as regrets later that other options were not given serious consideration		• No economic costs including taxes associated with the construction and operation/maintenance of the project will be passed onto Ontario taxpayers
March 29, 2007	• Article 'An Assault upon the community of WI" • If resident doesn't not have turbine on their property, no benefit for them	May 30, 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the project • Provided link to project website and public open house panels • Amenities Agreement: CEC is investing approximately $410 million to construct and operate the Project, with numerous economic benefits to the community • Local benefits to the community will include, among others: the creation of jobs; monies spent locally (estimated $64 million during construction); a new source of taxation for the Township(estimated $550,000/year paid by CREC); royalty payments made to participating landowners (estimated $1.2 million/year), and an Amenities Agreement with the Township for community betterment initiatives ($645,000/year) • modern wind turbines are large and visible structures, and therefore will create a change to the current Wolfe Island landscape -to help stakeholders better envision what the operating Project may look like, a Visual Change Assessment was undertaken for the ERR - some of the visual simulations were presented at the March 2007 Public Open House, and can be viewed on the project website. However, whether the visual change is positive or negative is a subjective opinion
March 29, 2007	• Industrial windmills belong in industrial areas • Appalled at blatant disregard for the people in community who are opposed to windmills • Need our research on effects of windmills on individuals validated at corporate level	May 24, 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the WI wind project • All information presented at the POH is now available on the Project's website • Would like to clarify two key items: • 1. project's consultation process has been ongoing since 2004

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	• Concerned that not one of the representatives of CHD appear to have any knowledge of the adverse effects • Our community has been divided and that has happened b/c some were given an unfair role of deciding for every single person on the Island our fate • Idea of windfarm should have been given a vote by the entire community. • Windmills will allow people to consume more, we are supposed to be conserving and these windmills don't represent that.		and has remained and continues to be open for stakeholder input and is transparent in terms of the process implemented • 2. responses to stakeholder questions and comments are provided directly to the commenting stakeholder as well as summarized in the ERR, report anticipated to be released in summer of 2007 • ERR for the Project prepared to assess effects of Project on environment, includes air, land, and water as well as natural, cultural, social and economic components • ERR being prepared using multidisciplinary team of specialists, according to and to be consistent MOE's *Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Electricity Projects* (March 2001) as mandated under Ontario Regulation 116/01, the Electricity Projects Regulation • ERR will be consistent with the provisions of the CEAA and the requirements identified in the NRCan document *Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines for Screenings of Inland Wind Farms Under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (2003). • rigorous and comprehensive review will also be conducted by all relevant agencies and stakeholders upon the completion of the ERR • Project is consistent with, and will work to achieve, Government of Ontario's target of providing 10% of its energy production from renewable resources by 2010. • Government of Canada outlined for Canadians framework for honouring international environmental commitments and for fostering the development of renewable energy sources such as wind
March 30, 2007	• Strongly in favour of project • Visual impact is a minor consequence	May 1, 2007	• Standard thank you letter

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	• A smoggy Kingston is not a visually attractive sight either		
March 30, 2007	• there are some technical issues viewing the display boards on the project website	April 2, 20007	• There were some technical difficulties posting the display boards on the project website. I apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused you. The display boards are now labeled under the correct headings, and you should have no problems viewing them. Thank you very much for your email
March 30, 2007	• please find attached report on environmentally significant wetland in your study area • government regulators will be interested in reviewing this report prior to providing any approval for the project • this report should be part of ERR	June 6, 2007	• Due to a high level of community interest, CREC has made the EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment. • Provided website and locations where EA could be viewed • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007
March 31, 2007	• still have not heard from anyone regarding questions sent on March 29, 2007	April 2, 2007 April 18, 2007	• Thank you for your comments on the WI Wind Project • We have received many comments as a result of hosting the POHs • Responding to each individual will take some time • We are hoping to provide formal responses to each individual within the next few weeks • Please see the message that was sent to your Email account, we were unaware that your Email account was not working • Please be assured that we are currently preparing a response that will address all of your concerns • We hope to get this to you as soon as possible
March 31, 2007	• runs bed and breakfast on WI, trying to assess impact of wind farm on their business • picked up pamphlet from POH which said that wind farm will attract a lot of people and are really good for business, but there were no figures	May 23, 2007	• Thank you for your comments on the Wolfe Island Wind Project • Water Wells: review of well water records along with monitoring of groundwater levels was conducted within Wolfe Island study area. Data from MOE indicates presence of 275 wells, with a mean depth to water of approximately 17 m. Of these, 122 are

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	• tried to find similar business close to such an operation, but could not – only one I could find was in Melancthon and presently has an appeal in with the OMB b/c second phase is right across the road from the business • can you give me some firm facts and figures addressing this issue or contact information for a B&B within 5km of a wind farm so I can get some reassurance? • WI is an IBA, I have seen some amazing species - you say that birds know how to avoid these structures, but with a turbine blade moving at 300 km/h, I don't know how they would see it, let alone avoid it • Has there been some consideration of the amount of fog that WI gets for birds in avoiding these turbines?		used for domestic water supply. • Turbine tower and transformer foundations, and transmission line infrastructure will generally not require excavation depth of more than four to eight metres-extensive dewatering during construction is not expected and effects to private water wells are unlikely. • Environmental Noise : MOE environmental noise guidelines for wind turbines are available from the MOE in their document entitled: Interpretation for Applying MOE NPC Technical Publications to Wind Turbine Generators (06 July 2004). Provided link to document- guideline indicates that for wind speeds of 6 m/s or less, in a Rural Area during the nighttime (defined as a Class 3 Area (Rural) in the guideline), sound levels at receptors should be 40 dB(A) or the minimum background sound level established pre-project, whichever is higher • ENIA is being prepared for the Project. – will assess potential effects of Project on environmental noise levels at receptors, CREC must comply with all regulatory requirements. Consistent with the MOE's review process, the ENIA is currently undergoing MOE technical review, which is preferred prior to its inclusion in the ERR. • Tourism**:** tourism impact assessment has been conducted for the Project and negative effects on the tourist industry in the area are not expected -report states there is potential for Project to have positive effect on local tourism industry • Research indicated wind plants can present opportunities for interpretation and provide an additional attraction/tour opportunity for both visitors and cottagers, contributing to increased tourism in the local area, while posing neutral effects to recreation • Birds comprehensive bird-monitoring program has been developed and implemented using guidance from Environment

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			Canada/Canadian Wildlife Service - bird studies include: habitat surveys, wintering raptors, spring waterfowl, spring migration, fall migration, breeding birds, and species at risk • With respect to birds avoiding wind turbines, a 2005 radar study showed many birds appear to detect wind plants at night (i.e., results in reduced visibility) and take action to avoid the wind turbines (EchoTrack, 2005)-radar studies showed many birds increased their flight height and slowed their flight speed when they approached the wind turbines and the research also concluded that reduced visibility (e.g., fog conditions) appeared to have no effect on the altitude of avian flight • wind industry is finding average mortality rate of one to two birds per turbine per year – put another way, a domestic cat that roams outside is likely to kill more birds in a year than a wind turbine-human-made structures such as buildings and windows, communications towers, and cars collectively cause annual mortality rates in the millions
March 31, 2007	• only concern regarding the Wolfe Island project is the interference of television signals caused by the rotating turbine blades • Will there be adverse interference to television signals for those of us using antennas for reception? If so, what provisions are you taking to insure that we are not adversely affected?	May 25 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the Wolfe Island Wind Project • All information presented at the POH now available on the project website • Provided information on possible tv signal interference, however, it is not anticipated that tv signals within the US will be affected as the turbines will not be within the line of site between receiver and sources • Wind turbines also do not affect HDTV or satellite tv • Theoretically Canadian tv signals could be affected, provided a list of mitigation measures to minimize the impacts
March 31, 2007	• Feels project has been kept secret • Property values will plummet • Noise issues • Depression	May 24, 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the Wolfe Island Wind Project • All information presented at the POH is now available on the Project's website • Consultation process: has been ongoing since 2004 – is open for

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	• Tourism will plummet		all stakeholder's input, and has been transparent in terms of process used • Based upon the data reviewed to date in other areas with established wind plants (e.g., Canada, USA, Europe, and Australia), no material adverse effect to property values is anticipated as a result of the renewable energy project. • Tourism: tourism impact assessment being conducted for project – not anticipated that effects of project will be significant, either positively or negatively • Noise: MOE environmental noise guidelines for wind turbines are available from the MOE in their document entitled: Interpretation for Applying MOE NPC Technical Publications to Wind Turbine Generators (06 July 2004). Provided link to document- guideline indicates that for wind speeds of 6 m/s or less, in a Rural Area during the nighttime (defined as a Class 3 Area (Rural) in the guideline), sound levels at receptors should be 40 dB(A) or the minimum background sound level established pre-project, whichever is higher • ENIA is being prepared for the Project. – will assess potential effects of Project on environmental noise levels at receptors, CREC must comply with all regulatory requirements. Consistent with the MOE's review process, the ENIA is currently undergoing MOE technical review, which is preferred prior to its inclusion in the ERR.
April 1, 2007	• this project will create an environment of 'haves' and 'have nots' • can't believe people will receive money for the Windmills being on their property and a tax relief. The tax relief is 25% of their neighbours tax bill as there land will be DEEMED agricultural, even if they don't farm the land • included information on make-up of property tax bill	May 30, 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the Wolfe Island Wind Project • Provided link to Project website and link to public open house panels • CREC is investing approximately $410 million to construct and operate the Project, with numerous economic benefits to the community • Local benefits to the community will include, among others: the

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			creation of jobs; monies spent locally (estimated $64 million during construction); a new source of taxation for the Township(estimated $550,000/year paid by CREC); royalty payments made to participating landowners (estimated $1.2 million/year), and an Amenities Agreement with the Township for community betterment initiatives ($645,000/year). • Royalty (Lease) Payments:CREC will make royalty payments or Land Lease payments to property owners to compensate them for the land CREC uses for the life of the Project-estimated to total approximately $1.2 million/year to participating landowners • Amenities Agreement: CREC has committed to pay an amenity fee directly to the Township of Frontenac Islands over and above royalty payments to individual landowners and property taxes, ensuring that the benefits of the Project extend over the whole community • The amenity fee of $645,000 represents approximately 74% of Wolfe Island and 54% of total Township tax revenues for 2006, and is expected to be at least six times higher than the Project's estimated property taxes to be paid to the Township of Frontenac Islands. Given the small impact of the Project on municipal infrastructure, the amenity fee is in effect new net revenue for the Township in excess of $390 per resident • Property Taxes: assessment of the Project for property tax purposes is determined according to the formula established by the Province of Ontario's Municipal Property Assessment Corporation ("MPAC"). Wind tower assessment is calculated according to the following formula: Assessed Value = $40,000 x Installed Capacity in Megawatts plus Number of Turbines x Cost of One Acre of Land • participating landowner's property taxes will increase due to Increase in assessed value

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			• CREC agreed to pay participating landowner difference between assessed value before turbine was on the property and the assessed value after a turbine is erected and operational • participating landowner is still responsible for paying the portion of their property taxes directly attributable to their land value • property taxes payable are calculated on the basis of zoning and prevailing property tax (mill) rates in the affected municipality • assuming current rates, the Project is estimated to pay $552,00 in property taxes annually • $552,000 will be paid approximately as follows: $111,000 to Township of Frontenac Islands; $51,000 to County of Frontenac; and $390,000 to education (School Boards)
April 2, 2007	• why there was a voluntary elevation? Can you please provide me with outstanding/new concerns so I can make comments on them? • Inquired about tourism, and if a tourism survey had been conducted • Most people don't have air conditioning and sleep with their windows open, please keep this in mind when preparing the noise assessment	May 1 2007	• The Project was initially categorized as a Screening, which would require the completion of a Screening Report. During the Screening stage of the Project, Canadian Hydro voluntarily elevated the Project to an Environmental Review (a more onerous process) due to aspects of the Project that warranted more detailed study and assessment. This decision was primarily made in response to the status of Wolfe Island as an Important Bird Area and the requirement for a submarine cable between Wolfe Island and the Kingston mainland. Rather than complete a Screening Report, consistent with Regulation 116/01, Canadian Hydro opted to proceed directly to the Environmental Review stage and complete a more extensive Environmental Review Report. • Effects on Tourism and Ferry: Tourism impact assessment and ferry impact assessment are being conducted – anticipated that effects on tourism and ferry use will not be significant • Noise: MOE requires the Project demonstrate compliance with its environmental noise guidelines • Sound levels at receptors should be 40 dB(A) or the minimum

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			background sound level established pre-project, whichever is higher. To demonstrate compliance with these requirements, an Environmental Noise Impact Assessment ("ENIA") has been prepared for the Project. The ENIA will assess the potential effects of the Project on environmental noise levels at receptors; the MOE defines residential dwellings or residences as receptors. CREC must comply with all regulatory requirements.
April 2, 2007	• sent link to Wolfe island wetland corridor study		• None required
April 2, 2007	• curious about the "rare species occurrence" marked on Simcoe Island • would like to know what the rare species is • I would also disagree with one of the assertions on the butterfly display panel. • You state that there are no migration concentrations of Monarchs on Wolfe Island • We have a cottage on the West side of Simcoe • due to the amount of milkweed growing on our property, we have a very healthy monarch population. Last September, there were hundreds (possibly • thousands) of them collecting prior to migrating (included pictures of monarchs on Island)	April 3/07	• thanks for your interest in POH last week • the rare species recorded on Simcoe Island is Least Bittern – small heron-like bird that inhabits large emergent marshes • designated as 'threatened' in Ontario, and Canada primarily because of a lot of wetland habitat has been lost over the past several decades
April 2, 2007	• can you send me information of the laying of submarine cables • details concerning shoreline treatments • dimension/construction details • what are sub cable dimensions • how are they bundled • safety measures proposed • what is proposed distance of cable from eastern shore of Simcoe Island to western shore of Garden Island • what is the fibre optic cable to be used for	May 30, 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the WI Wind Project, provided Project website link and link to public open house display boards • Submarine Cable Description: transmission line consists of one 235 mm diameter, three conductor armoured cable. Each conductor is 987 KCMIL copper with cross-linked polyethylene ("XLPE") insulation. Provided link to corresponding display board • submarine cable will be protected by electronic protection relays and high voltage circuit breakers, as well as remote teleprotection to Hydro One's system - fibre optic cable you

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	• have you discussed conflicts with the city's proposed expansion of the west water treatment plant and how the cable may affect future expansions?		mentioned will facilitate supervisory control and data acquisition ("SCADA") and protection requirements • Submarine Cable Route: 230 kV submarine cable from Wolfe Island to Kingston mainland will consist of an approximately 7.8 km segment of cable, connected directly to underground cable with a direct buried splice at both ends near river shoreline on mainland and Wolfe Island • final location of submarine cable will be determined during the detailed engineering phase of the Project-cable will be approximately 937 m from eastern shore of Simcoe Island and 1425 m (1.4 km) from the western shore of Garden Island • Construction Details: transmission cable is planned to be trenched in nearshore at each landfall and subsequently laid along bottom of the Lower Gap for a distance of about 7.8 km • At landfalls, on-land cable trenching operation will continue from shoreline into the nearshore to a water depth of approximately 3-4 m to protect the cable from shorefast ice development in winter and occasional wind-driven ice pile-up events in spring • Beyond nearshore section of burial, cable will be laid directly on riverbed along the predetermined GPS-controlled route from a cable-laying vessel- Protective measures such as polyethylene collars and concrete revetment mattresses will be installed, where required, to protect the cable from wearing on the bedrock or boulders • West Water Treatment Plant: CREC is currently undergoing discussions with Utilities Kingston and private landowners to ensure that transmission line routing will not conflict with future expansion of the West WaterTreatment Plant.
April 2, 2007	• what consideration has been given to impact on residents of Hwy 96 between 2nd and 4th line road • what were the environmental issues identified in the study	June 6, 2007	• Due to the high level of community interest CREC has made the EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment.

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	completed to date that precipitated the decision to elevate the project • take exception to fact that information meetings have not included tax-paying seasonal residents		• Provided link to Project website where Draft EA can be found, and a list of locations where hard copies can be viewed • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in the correspondence you submitted via written letter on April 2 and April 7, 2007 and via the Project website on 12 April 2007: Public consultation and information disclosure, Public Health and Safety, Environmental Noise, Shadow Flicker, Property Values, Economic Wind Power Supply Mix, Tourism Turbine, Environmental Screening • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007
April 4, 2007	• can't find panels showing views from different vantage points of the windmills in 'enhanced simulated photos' • someone from Stantec said they would be on the website by evening on the day after the POH • I still can't find the, can you tell me how to get them from your site if they are there? Or, please post them now so they can be seen	April 4, 2007	• Thank you for your interest in WI Wind Project • All display boards are now on website • If you scroll down, you will find eight display panel titles that begin with 'visual simulation' these are the boards you are interested in • If you have difficulties, please don't hesitate to contact us
April 4, 2007	• Thank you, did you just put these up now? I didn't see them when I emailed you and I'm pretty sure that I had scrolled to the bottom of the list. Nor did I see several of the other headings there now, like 'birds' and 'bats'. I'm glad they're up now, that you for responding to my inquiry so promptly	April 4, 2007	• We posted the boards on the website on Friday, but experienced some technical difficulties (i.e. missing boards) and had to put them up again on Monday. I'm glad you're now able to access them without any troubles!
April 4, 2007	• They weren't up Wednesday morning when I emailed you. But I'm glad they're up now.		• No response necessary
April 4, 2007	• Could not find board listing the studies that were conducted	April 4/07	• Was sent the link to the appropriate board
April 4, 2007	• Wishes to contest Environ. Screening Report • Concern with destruction of landscape and property value • Health impacts associated with shadow flicker, inaudible sound	June 6, 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the Wolfe Island Wind Project • Due to the high level of community interest in this renewable energy initiative, CREC has made the EA available in DRAFT

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	• Ample evidence to show that shadow flicker can initiate migraines, well established link between inaudible noise and tinnitus, vertigo, and constellation of disorders of acoustic nerve • Propose that Environ. Screen Report be adjusted to reflect potential negative effects with regard to human health effect on local businesses		form for stakeholder review and comment. • Provided link to Project's website where EA can be found, and locations where EA can be viewed • In response to your comments, the following sections are provided: Technical Appendix H of the DRAFT EA, Recreation and Tourism, Public Health and Safety Groundwater, Transmission Lines Access Roads, Decommissioning, Viewshed Emergency Preparedness Plan, Maintenance and Monitoring Ferry Traffic Employment Opportunities, Shadow, Future Phases of the Project • There is no proposed or planned second phase of the Wolfe Island Wind Project.
April 5, 2007	• New windfarm on PEI is causing sleepless nights, despite official approval of noise levels • Still feel that proposed development is far too extensive and turbines too large for WI • Would recommend developer offer tour of similar wind farm and debate where both pro and con arguments can be heard • Marketing surrounding wind energy does little to prepare people for inevitable side effects • Concerned with effects on lifestyle, tourism, property values • April 6, 2007 – sent attachments again, problem with previous attachment	June 6, 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the Project • Due to high level of community interest, CREC has made the DRAFT EA available for stakeholder review and comment. • Provided link to project website and locations where EA can be viewed • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address your specific concerns: Visual Change, Noise, Tourism, Property Values • Stakeholder comments will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 pm on 29 June 2007
April 7, 2007	• Lives in Cape Vincent - nearest turbine in your proposed wind farm will be 2.35 km (1.36 miles) from our shoreline. • A distance over a mile seems like a reasonable setback	May 24, 2007	• Birds: comprehensive bird-monitoring program has been developed and implemented using guidance from Environment Canada/Canadian Wildlife Service

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	under normal overland conditions, but as you may be aware, sound travels remarkably better over water than land, hence my concern • to better understand the possible problems associated with wind farm noise propagated over water, I found and reviewed the DEIS material provided for the Cape Cod Wind Park (CapeWindProjectPlanFiling.pdf). • It indicated that most residences were 5 miles or more distant from the park's turbines and as such did not contribute much noise to nearby residents. • Fortunately for me, they also conducted a noise assessment for a navigational buoy (G5) approximately 1 mile north of the border of their wind park • background levels at G5 were 35 and 46 dBA, for L90 and Leq, respectively. I would also presume that ambient L90 levels along our side of the river would be similar, especially at night • their modelling considered sound propagation over water and the results indicated that sound levels at G5 were predicted to be 61.2 dBA at the design wind condition (I assume near maximum sound emission). • This level constitutes a 15.2 dBA increase over background, which is considerably greater than a doubling of the background sound (35X the power) • If your proposed turbines transmitted noise in a similar fashion across the St. Lawrence, the noise experienced by residents along the U.S. side of the river would far exceed what anyone would consider reasonable. I would also think Canadian residents living close to the river on the north shore would have similar concerns		• Bird studies conducted for project include: habitat surveys, wintering raptors, spring waterfowl, spring migration, fall migration, breeding birds, and species at risk-avian surveys have been ongoing on Wolfe Island since 2004 • results of the monitoring program and surveys will be made available within the Environmental Review Report ("ERR") • Environmental Noise**:** MOE requires Project demonstrate compliance with environmental noise guidelines. MOE environmental noise guidelines for wind turbines are available from the MOE in their document entitled: *Interpretation for Applying MOE NPC Technical Publications to Wind Turbine Generators* (06 July 2004). Provided link to guidelines • An ENIA is being conducted for Project - ENIA will assess potential effects of Project on environmental noise levels at receptors within one kilometre of a wind turbine; MOE defines residential dwellings or residences as receptors. At distances greater than one kilometre, noise impact due to wind turbine operation is insignificant. Consequently, a noise assessment is not required by MOE. CREC must comply with all regulatory requirements. Consistent with the MOE's review process, the ENIA is currently undergoing MOE technical review, which is preferred prior to its inclusion in the ERR • In terms of the methodology used for the ENIA, the following information is provided: • *Your comment: Model parameters that accurately predict noise transmission over water* • Calculations are performed in accordance with "ISO 9613-2 standard entitled: Acoustics – Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors – Part 2: General Method of calculation". Water is considered acoustically hard, by this standard. This means that ground attenuation over soft ground such as grass,

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			trees or other vegetation is more than ground attenuation over water. • *Your comment: Include a worst-case noise prediction scenario at U.S. residences using maximum sound emitted from turbines with background levels of 35 dBA (L90), which would simulate conditions associated with night-time atmospheric stability* • We calculate the typical worst case scenario using guaranteed average turbine emission levels with a quality assurance of +/- 1 dBA as defined by the equipment manufacturer, using a typical octave band emission spectrum which is measured in accordance with international standard IEC 61400-11. We assume background levels of 34 dBA (L90) when the wind is 6m/s at a height of 10m. We calculate for typical weather conditions of 15 deg C, 80% humidity, which represents a predictable worst case as defined by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment. • *Your comment: Incude a comprehensive assessment of the character of turbine sound, specifically amplitude modulation with a 1 hz pulse, and include projected sound levels of the modulation peaks at night on the U.S. shore.* • Turbines are measured in accordance with international standard IEC 61400-11, which considers tonality, but does not penalize amplitude modulation. The ISO 9613-2 standard adopts the Leq as the noise descriptor of choice. The Leq is defined as the equivalent continuous sound level, which in a stated time and at a stated location, has the same energy as the time varying signal. acoustic energy of turbine noise modulated peaks is included in the predicted Leq at all receptors within the study area • *Your comment: Also, calculate the additional noise that would be associated with synchronous operation from two or more turbines*

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			during night-time atmospheric stability • We calculate the Leq total noise from all 86 turbines operating simultaneously, at wind speeds of 6m/s, 7m/s, 8m/s, 9m/s, 10m/s and 11m/s. The Leq total noise does not increase if two or more turbines have blades which are perfectly synchronous with respect to rpm and with respect to spatial orientation to the turbine tower • *Your comment: The final configuration and operation of your wind farm should ensure that its noise would not exceed the natural background noise we currently live with on our side of the river* • acoustic model predicts that sound levels will be within the MOE's acceptable sound level limits at nearest point of reception on Wolfe Island. This condition ensures acceptable levels will be realized at all receptors located further away. Based on review of our acoustic model and our experience in measuring existing wind farms, we conclude turbine noise may be audible at Cape Vincent shoreline at low wind speeds less than or equal to 6 m/s under certain weather conditions, however sound level will be well below the MOE's acceptable sounds level limits.
April 8, 2007	• Sent two letters • Concerned that not everyone on municipal tax roll was informed of project • Concerned with health effects • Property value, people at Melancthon unable to see their homes • Jobs • Wants to know which source of power will be reduced b/c of the wind farms • Is there an appeal process at this level? • Concerned about loss of tourism and lower quality of life • Why did representative make the misleading statement that	June 6, 2007	• Due to the high level of community interest CREC has made the EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment. • Provided link to Project website where Draft EA can be found, and a list of locations where hard copies can be viewed • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in the correspondence you submitted via written letter on April 2 and April 7, 2007 and via the Project website on 12 April 2007: Public consultation and information disclosure, Public Health and Safety, Environmental Noise, Shadow Flicker, Property Values, Economic Wind Power Supply Mix, Tourism Turbine, Environmental Screening

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	there is overwhelming support for the project given the hostile atmosphere at the meeting? • What issues prompted elevation of project • What are reasons for high density of turbines?		• Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007
April 10, 2007	• Looked at the website and it was great to see the boards from last night up already, however none of the picture boards are there? Am I looking in the wrong place?	April 10 2007	• information available on project website • sent direct link to Public Open House display panels • provided KH's contact information
April 10, 2007	• Requests information on setbacks • Understands there are two appeals to OMB for the project, please direct her to information on the appeals	May 24, 2007	• Setbacks for Wind Turbines: Township of Frontenac Islands has decided minimum setback distances through zoning process- important to note that zoning bylaw setbacks represent minimum that will be applied to the Project-Provided table with municipal zoning by-law setbacks • In addition to zoning setbacks, MOE requires project demonstrate compliance with environmental noise guidelines – which also affects the distance of wind turbines from receptors (i.e., houses). • unlike zoning setbacks which tend to be a linear measured distance in metres, noise setbacks are determined based on sound levels at receptors (e.g., houses) as measured in a-weighted decibels. Provided link to MOE guideline • should be noted that other environmental factors, such as setbacks to wetlands, woodlots, and watercourses, regard for agricultural land, infrastructure, and wind direction, etc., combine with the zoning setbacks to assist in determining final layout of the project. • Ontario Municipal Board ("OMB") : Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing has approved Official Plan Amendment that establishes policies for wind development in the Township of Frontenac Islands- Amendment came into force in January 2007 • Zoning By-Law was approved by the Township Council in

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			November 2006- By-Law was subsequently appealed by two individuals. These appeals are working their way through the OMB process. For clarity, the zoning By-Law does not require approval from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing • Provided contact information for obtaining more information on OMB appeals
April 12, 2007	• When will you conduct a hydrogeological assessment to investigate the impact of construction on the natural water table • When will you accurate artists' renditions of turbines that include the transmission lines, indicate the nature of construction required to bury the lines • When will you accurate artists' renditions of network of access roads • Inquired about decommissioning and bond provision with the municipality to guarantee site clearing costs are met • will CHD Inc. provide annual reports of energy production and all other non-proprietory information • When does the company propose to begin Phase 2 • When will you conduct a detailed survey of the lake bottom to ensure fish feeding and reproduction is not disturbed? When will you survey the lake bottom historically sensitive sites are not disturbed • when will you complete a visual impact assessment which studies zones of visual influence • When will you provide a detailed emergency preparedness plan for the project • Will the company post a schedule of regular maintenance and provide an annual report detailing maintenance requirements • Will maintenance workers from Kingston be secured priority	June 6, 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the Project • Due to the high level of community interest in this renewable energy initiative, CREC has made the EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment • Provided link and locations where Draft EA could be viewed • In response to your comments, the following sections are provided: Technical Appendix H of the DRAFT EA, Recreation and Tourism, Public Health and Safety Groundwater, Transmission Lines Access Roads, Decommissioning, Viewshed Emergency Preparedness Plan, Maintenance and Monitoring Ferry Traffic Employment Opportunities, Shadow, Future Phases of the Project • There is no proposed or planned second phase of the Wolfe Island Wind Project.

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	placement on the Wolfe Islander III ferry • when will you provide a detailed plan outlining the scheduling of construction and its effects of ferry access for residents and tourists • inquired about jobs • inquired about shadow flicker and effect on residents and schools, children with autism • what is the protocol for stakeholders who have been diagnosed with migraines, Meniere disorder, tinnitis and autism in this process		
April 12, 2007	• Has suffered for years with migraines • Daughter has Menier's disorder, and tinnitus • Concerned with effects of shadow flicker, glint, audible noise, low-frequency noise and vibration on tinnitus and Meniere's disorder • Does the proximity of turbines intensify their effects on tinnitus and meniers's disorder • Also concerned about effects on autistic children	June 6, 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the Project • Due to the high level of community interest in this renewable energy initiative CREC has made the EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment. • Provided link and locations where DRAFT EA could be viewed • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA - beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in the correspondence you submitted via written letter on April 2 and April 7, 2007 and via the Project website on 12 April 2007: Public consultation and information disclosure, Public Health and Safety, Environmental Noise, Shadow Flicker, Property Values, Economic Wind Power Supply Mix, Tourism Turbine, Environmental Screening • As the Wolfe Island Wind Project proceeds, we will notify you of future activities. • In the meantime, if you have any questions or comments

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			with regards to the DRAFT EA or the Project in general, feel free to contact us directly • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007.
April 13, 2007	• has not received a response to my inquires as set out below and was wondering if you could let me know when I might expect to hear from you • has a further question about who is responsible for dismantling the windmills once they reach the end of their useful life or otherwise become obsolete. Will that be the responsibility of the owner of the land or the owner of the windmill or someone else • how this obligation to properly decommission the windmills will be enforced - for example, by ensuring their is adequate financial assurance, contractually or otherwise		• Thank you for your comments resulting from the POHs for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, held on March 27 and 28, 2007 Provided link to Project's website and direct link to POH panels • Due to high level of community interest CREC has made the harmonized EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA - beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP • Provided locations where EA is available for viewing • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence: Ferry Traffic, Permits and Approvals, Transmission Lines, Decommissioning Future Phases of Project – there is no proposed or planned second phase of the Wolfe Island Wind Project. • As the Wolfe Island Wind Project proceeds, we will notify you of future activities. • In the meantime, if you have any questions or comments with regards to the DRAFT EA or the Project in general, feel free to contact us directly • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007.
April 15, 2007	• would like to be on project mailing list • concerned with impacts on birds/bats, shadow flicker and	May 1, 2007	• thank you for your comments on the Public Open House • in response to the comments you submitted via comment

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	noise		card and webmail, the following information is provided • Environmental Review Report ("ERR"): currently in process of completing ERR • planned that ERR will be made available for public review and comment during the summer of 2007 • Agencies and stakeholders will be provided notice of when and where ERR will be made available • Noise: ENIA is being prepared for entire project. • report is also reviewed by technical staff at MOE to ensure they are in agreement with predicted project sound levels. • ENIA will be included within ERR and made available for public review and comment. • project will meet the applicable MOE guidelines for environmental noise • Shadow Flicker**:** shadow flicker report has been prepared for the Project, and will be included within the ERR for review. • Birds and Bats**:** comprehensive bird and bat monitoring program has been developed and implemented using guidance from the MNR and Environment Canada/Canadian Wildlife Service. • bird studies conducted for project include: habitat surveys, wintering raptors, spring waterfowl, spring migration, fall migration, breeding birds, and species at risk. • avian surveys have been ongoing on Wolfe Island since 2004.
April 16, 2007	• copied Stantec to letter to MOE regarding the zoning by-law setting setbacks being passed before the release of the ESR		• No response required
April 18, 2007	• Recently in the Orangeville Banner there was an article about an oil spill at your Melancthon plant • Concerned with potential for spill on WI, and effect on well	May 3, 2007	• recent mineral oil spill at our Melancthon facility was located within the maintenance yard of the Melancthon Wind Farm and not at an individual wind turbine

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	water • How would such an incident be dealt with		• spill was cleaned up voluntarily by Canadian Hydro and all clean up tasks required by the MOE to protect the environment and human health were completed. As noted within the article, a representative from the municipality stated that the municipality had no concerns about the incident or how it was handled • a representative from the MOE indicated that there were no impacts to drinking water supplies or service water and there were no likely environmental impacts as a result of the spill • A review of well water records along with monitoring of groundwater levels was conducted within the Wolfe Island study area. Data from the Ontario Ministry of the Environment indicates the presence of 275 wells, with a mean depth to water of approximately 17 m. Of these, 122 are used for domestic water supply. Turbine tower and transformer foundations, and transmission line infrastructure will generally not require excavation depth of more than four to eight metres. As such, extensive dewatering during construction is not expected and effects to private water wells are unlikely. The potential effects and applicable mitigation measures for water wells will be fully addressed in the Environmental Review Report ("ERR") being prepared for the Project. The ERR is anticipated to be released for stakeholder review in summer 2007 • Construction Contractor, with oversight from CREC, will prepare a Project Construction and Environmental Management Plan ("CEMP") prior to the initiation of any substantive on-site works
April 19, 2007	• Letter to Robert Helie, Environment Canada • It is our opinion that the failure of the legislation to identify the need for the completion of the environmental screening prior to the passing of planning amendments gives rise to a serious and fatal impediment to sustainable development • Concerned that the project has become driven by economic		No response required

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	consideration, rather than environmental isses and that the Island's unique and essential environmental importance may be overlooked and buried in the political rhetoric of green power • We are hoping that you will take some time to consider the project and the issues raised above, and forward these concerns to all necessary parties at EC, to ensure that the issues affecting the international and domestic development and sustainability of Great Lakes wetlands and migratory bird patterns will be reviewed.		
April 23, 2007	• sent letter inquiring about health concerns: specifically migraines, tinnitus, Menieres disorder and autism	June 6, 2007	• Thank you for your comments resulting from the POHs for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, held on March 27 and 28, 2007 Provided link to Project's website and direct link to POH panels • Due to high level of community interest CREC has made the harmonized EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA - beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP • Provided locations where EA is available for viewing • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence: Public consultation and information disclosure, Public Health and Safety, Environmental Noise, Shadow Flicker, Property Values, Economic Wind Power Supply Mix, Tourism Turbine, Environmental Screening • As the Wolfe Island Wind Project proceeds, we will notify you of future activities. • In the meantime, if you have any questions or comments

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
			with regards to the DRAFT EA or the Project in general, feel free to contact us directly • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007.
April 27, 2007	• attached are my comments regarding the proposed wind plant at Wolfe Island. • I would appreciate if all of you could confirm reception of this email • Disputes one section of the Environmental Baseline Report which states that the interior of Wolfe Island is comprised of loosely aggregated farmhouses with associated farm buildings. A number of these buildings have been abandoned recently • Does not feel the section which states that higher density residential and recreational areas are found in Marysville, along the northern shoreline of Wolfe Island, and along the southern shoreline of Reeds Bay reflects the density of homes on the shore between Simcoe Island and Wolfe Island • Concerned with section in Environmental Overview Report on property values and that it does not offer adequate mitigation measure • Concerned that landowners with severed building lots is not protected in same fashion as those with dwellings on their property • Concerned with noise • Concerned about birds, specifically raptors • Concerned with visual impact • Concerned with transmission lines	June 6, 2007	• Thank you for your comments resulting from the POHs for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, held on March 27 and 28, 2007 Provided link to Project's website and direct link to POH panels • Due to high level of community interest CREC has made the harmonized EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA - beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP • Provided locations where EA is available for viewing • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence: Property Value, Birds, Environmental Noise, Viewshed, Transmission Lines, Waste • As the Wolfe Island Wind Project proceeds, we will notify you of future activities. • In the meantime, if you have any questions or comments with regards to the DRAFT EA or the Project in general, feel free to contact us directly • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007.

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
	• Concerned with waste disposal in landfill on Island – already rapidly filling		
May 3, 2007	• sent an earlier e-mail with a letter attached and asked for confirmation that it had been received • I have not heard back, did you get my e-mail and letter?	May 3, 2007	• We have received your email and letter. We are currently in the process of drafting a response. I apologize for the delay.

1.1.2 Comments Received by Phone, Fax, and Mail

Date	Comment	Date	Response
December 9, 2005	• Offered legal description of property on WI • Wants to be sure that it is designated as a 'residence site' even though no structure exists yet • Will transmission lines be aerial or buried? • Suggests that CHD give all WI residents a reduced rate on their power bills	December 9 2005	• Will treat property as a residence • Power lines on WI will be both underground and above • Power lines to Kingston will be above and underground • Taxes paid by wind plant will go to County, Township, and education system – all with little to no demand for government services • CHD generates electricity, does not distribute, therefore as no mechanism to influence billing rates or discounts from local service provider/distributor
Jan 8, 2006	• Spoke of article in Watertown Daily Time summarizing interview with Mr. Keating • Featured map of WI, indicating that 86 turbines would be sited in a corridor running n/s between highway 95 and 5th line road • Concerned that siting plan will be phase one of WI windfarm project, guess is that once infrastructure is in place, more turbines will be added east and west of the phase one corridor. Wasn't original proposal for about 300 turbines?	Jan 9, 2006	• Without having seen the article, can only offer following information about project as it stands today • Planning a 2.3 MW wind turbine generators = 86 turbines • Planning area for project is from old canal that runs generally north-south on the east side of Marysville to the western shores • Highway 95 is essentially the middle north-south point of the planning area • Prior to acquisition of the CREC, CREC had applied for and received from the Independent Electricity System Operator an interconnection capacity for up to 200MW, not 300 wind turbines • There are many unknown factors at this point in time concerning the future of renewable energy market in Ontario, right now, we are concentrating on building the project for which we have an existing RES Contract – any future project would be required to go through similar regulatory approvals process • We have no lands in the eastern half of the Island under option for wind turbines

Date	Comment	Date	Response
Jan 22, 2005	• A Wolfe Island resident told me today that they heard that the wind farm developer was purchasing lots on Reeds Bay road for a 'storage facility'. Any truth in this? Still trying to make decision about building a Jan 25, 2006residence there. Would CHD have any interest in acquiring my lot?	Jan 25, 2006	• There is partial truth in the rumor, as we are considering the possible purchase of property for our operations and maintenance building and transformer stations; however, we've yet to make any formal inquiries • If we do pursue this option, we will likely be looking for more than five acres and adjacent to the main power line • We will keep your property in mind as we move forward with the project
Jan 25, 2006	• Thanks for comments • Would like to be kept informed of project developments		No response required
Feb 22, 2006	• thanks for notice of Public Open House • will attend • send a note from another stakeholder	Feb 23, 2006	Information passed on
Feb 23, 2006	• looks forward to meeting at Public Open House • thanks for keeping me in the loop		No response required
March 5, 2006	• wanted to be sure that the Public Open House was still scheduled, contacts at Island haven't heard anything about it yet	March 5, 2006	• notice will be in local newspapers this coming week • Public Open House will be on March 22, 2006 on WI
March 5, 2006	• Thanks, look forward to meeting CHD staff		No response required
March 26/07	• missed you at Public Open House, when I got there the gal behind the table said you had just left for another meeting • presentation of wind farm was helpful • looking forward to the phase of the planning that will let the public know exactly where the turbines and transmission lines will go	March 26, 2006	• hopeful to be back on WI in and around June showing proposed turbine layout, access roads, and power lines • will once again send you a notice • faxed information will get back to CHD via Stantec,
March 26, 2006	• look forward to next meeting		No response required

Date	Comment	Date	Response
April 06/06	• Provides link to project, website contains several documents related to environmental approvals for the project – in particular the 'Documents" page contains the Environmental Overview Report, which will provide additional information regarding construction activities		No response required
Postmarked Apr 11, 2006	• In areas where these massive towers and blades already exist, people nearby go mad with the constant drone, whine, noise and vibration, night and day, year after year • Installation: the exorbitant cost will take donkeys years to recover by which time the structures will be dilapidated. • Wind power in NO WAY reduces current fuel demands and usage • No savings: they do not save the consumer any money • They also, especially on Wolfe Island, will destroy the ground water and dry up the wells as you have to drill and blast far into the bedrock to support the structures • Environment issues: • Access roads and buildings will destroy all habitat for deer, wild animals and make the island an Industrial Wasteland Park. • it is a direct route for migrating birds fall and spring and home to all-year round Peregrine Falcons, Coopers Hawks and to Eagles amongst other raptors (a bird sanctuary) • The view from Kingston over the lake will be ruined (an eyesore in a tourist area) • Value of Wolfe Island property will fall. The rural peaceful life will be lost forever for us residents (economic loss) • Water view from Kingston homes will be ruined, the property values will fall (economic disaster) • Wolfe Island is a bird sanctuary and conservation area and trees		• Could not respond, contact information illegible.

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	cannot be cut out or development occur • Your companies will be sued by individuals and class actions by local area residents. Cease your plan. Legal costs alone will bankrupt you.		
April 20/06	• DH introduced Rob Nadolny to Kiewit, would like him to take a look at website • They are representatives on Prince wind farm, would like to get more jobs in the field • DH has engineering degree • He would like to hear from Rob and please send him any information about upcoming projects • Tenders welcome	April 20/06	• thank you for calling and sending this message to indicated interest in the project • Stantec has been retained to conduct environmental studies required for the WI wind farm project, RN will be please to forward information to client • Gave wind farm website so DH can keep updated on the project
April 25, 2006	• Resume to participate in WI Wind Project as part of her co-op program		Forwarded resume to CREC
May 11, 2006	• Recently started development on Reeds Bay lot. Wanted to be sure that your planning designates my lot as a residential property • Still hoping most turbines will be sited along highway 95 corridor	May 12, 2006	• We have marked your lot as having a future residence – would you have a draft site plan of your lot (showing potential location of the residence) for our reference? • Targeting late June for the next project open house
May 12, 2006	• planning second meeting with excavation contractor next week to finalize plans for a septic system • should be able to forward a comprehensive site plan end of this month		No follow-up required
May 30/06	• please find attached my response to the Proposed Official Plan Amendment which would permit the development of Commercial Wind Farms on lands designated Agricultural on Schedule "A": to the Official Plan • attaching this in respect to our conversation regarding Wind Power Generation and anticipated wildlife impacts on Wolfe Island from	20 June 2007	• Thank you for your letter dated 30 May 2007 • We appreciate your involvement in the Environmental Screening Process (ESP) • For clarification, my request for a copy of your letter was for use in the ESP, not to advise you against making a submission to the

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	the wind power generation which is of vital concern to a number of Wolfe Island Residents who care about the Island • Upon your recommendation, I am sending this letter to you outlining these concerns and ways to prevent action which would jeopardize important wildlife populations in the southwestern section of the Island, rather than submit it to the Meeting to Consider a Proposed Official Plan Amendment under Sections 17 and 22 of the Planning Act, May 31, 2006 for which it was originally intended respecting your role in the EA process • You indicated, this meeting is not the proper setting for such a submission but rather I should forward the letter directly to you for the distribution and action • Common sense does not accept that wildlife mortality is similar in extent to highway death and injuries, office tower impact, and like the small wind power generator in downtown Toronto that has been used in the past to placate concerns • The area of Wolfe island has specific locations with dense concentrations of waterfowl over extended periods of time on a daily basis which because of their behaviour and numbers are particularly vulnerable to the turbines • The issues that I have referred to in my letter are of increasing concern on Wolfe island • This should be an opportunity for the company to demonstrate sound environmental practices consistent with conservation ethos expressed by wind energy producers		Township of Frontenac Islands • Your comments directly pertain to the ESP for the Project and will be used by the Study Team as we proceed through the process • The ESP will address a broad range of environmental aspects of the project, including the biological, physical and socio-economic perspectives • While we have yet to complete the ESP for the Project, we are aware that WI is an Important Bird Area for waterfowl and that raptors use the area • During the course of the Project we have accumulated both primary and secondary information on this subject • Throughout the ESP, we have been and will continue to work with government agencies, local wildlife groups such as the Kingston Field Naturalists and Ducks Unlimited, residents, and other stakeholders to obtain additional information as part of the ESP • Information you have provided will help us evaluate the potential environmental effects of the Project and ensure that the environmental benefits of the Project are maximized • In addition to detailed review of previous studies conducted in the area, waterfowl surveys have been conducted as part of the ESP • We are also continuing to work with municipal, provincial, and federal government agencies, such as the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment Canada, and Canadian Wildlife Service, to ensure that our data collection and analysis methodologies adhere to relevant protocols, policies, and legislation • The final results of these activities will be presented in the ERR; which we expect will be available for stakeholder review later this year • In terms of avian mortality, the wind industry is finding an average

Date	Comment	Date	Response
			mortality rate of 1-2 birds per turbine per year with the modern turbines (i.e. conical steel towers versus steel lattice towers) • Canadian investigations of the potential effects of wind turbines on waterfowl indicates that waterfowl generally appear to avoid wind turbines and that few fatalities, relative to the numbers of waterfowl generally appear to avoid wind turbines and that few fatalities, relative to the numbers of waterfowl have been reported. Another observation was that birds change their behaviour by increasing their flight altitude to avoid flying close to wind turbines. For continued reference, this study has been uploaded to the project website: www.wolfeislandwind.com • Waterfowl feeding areas will also be considered as part of the ESP; however, as you may be aware some species such as the Canadian Goose will forage on the group in proximity to wind turbines • Thanks again for sharing your comments with us • As the Wolfe Island Wind Project continues to evolve, please feel free to contact me directly if you have any additional questions or comments about the ongoing work related to preparation of the ERR for this project
30 May 2006	• Letter to Council of Corporation (Township of Frontenac Islands) • Provides educational background in waterfowl management, and wetland and waterfowl research • In early 1970s, recognized the unique nature of southwestern area of Wolfe Island, a special waterfowl ecosystem • In order to preserve and enhance this special habitat, I acquired critical properties containing farm and wetland and have continued to do so • I have been assisted by local landowners in different ways leading to		No response required

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	the protection of populations of waterfowl including Mallards, Black Ducks, Pintails, along with Canadian and Snow Geese which use the adjacent protected harbour as refuge from weather and staging areas • The project was further recognized by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Canadian Wildlife Service in the 1970's who designated the adjacent lake area as protected and placed no hunting signage throughout • This remained the only protected area on Wolfe Island for years – increasing numbers of waterfowl have come to this general area fanning out in feeding forays across the entire western end of Wolfe Island foraging in great numbers in certain regions making it a particularly unique feature on the Island • Recognized that this particular region is highly attractive to Mallards and Black Ducks making it one of the most populous in Eastern Canada for these and other species which include Raptors which in turn interact with the waterfowl population • Ducks and Geese remain in this area for extended periods sometimes wintering as in 2006. As an example, throughout the fall and winter of 2005 and 2006 considerable concentrations of Mallards, Black Ducks, Pintails and Canada Geese as well as many other species such as Green-winged Teal, numbering from four to six thousand birds were continuously present through March and April when there was further significant recruitment as additional numbers arrived during spring migration • These are not just birds in the midst of migration with only temporary association with the region, but this waterfowl population remains in very large numbers leading to their expected interaction with injury and death to turbines • Should not be construed as occasional random collisions or even the greater interaction expected of migration but large numbers of		

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	ducks and geese continuously moving over extended periods often at times of poor visibility and even at night and thus vulnerable to impacts with the turbines on a continuous basis • Overflights begin in the south shore from where they pass over adjacent properties at variable altitudes anywhere from 20 to 200 metres, with the heavies concentrations between 30 and 50 metres • Birds move continuously in large flocks (thousands) and in smaller groups particularly during periods of inclement weather and windy conditional when visibility and maneuverability is poor increasing their likelihood of collision with the moving parts of wind turbines • In recognition of this unique situation, I have personally forgone the financial returns of wind turbines on my property since to do otherwise would be unconscionable given the expected interaction but these waterfowl need protection beyond as I have indicated • Clear that the positioning of wind power turbines in this general region will have a devastating impact on waterfowl flocks more so near the lake and up to 6 to 10 km inland and may be particularly damaging to already declining species such as Black Ducks which are particularly attracted to this region • Would be a serious mistake and simply irresponsible to place wind turbines in their flight paths undermining the overall intent of wind power, that is to provide energy as a means of conservation but at minimal cost to the environment • My land and others adjacent to proposed projects has been dedicated to wildlife enhancement including hedgerows which act as critical corridors for other wildlife species to access feeding areas from cover and returning, as well as providing important food for these animals • There must be adequate cover in these hedgerows to be effective for this purpose		

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	• Disturbance of hedgerows by newly constructed roadways would seriously impact this important element of the ecosystem. Turbines and access to turbines must be substantially away from these hedgerows • Wind power may be a contribution to energy needs, but it must be in the context of sound relationships with the environment • It's not a question of placement and later removal, if certain sites are unsuitable, but recognition of sensitive lands and protecting them from the start • Mistakes will require very expensive mitigation. Sitings of the units must be based on sound current information so that particularly sensitive ecosystems may be protected • No matter where wind power generators are positioned on Wolfe Island, there will be important negative impacts including bird collisions during migration as well as other expected wildlife contacts including their disappearance in the area near the generators • Some areas identified as particularly susceptible must be protected requiring that wind tower not be sited in these locations • Otherwise the remarkable ecosystem unique to Wolfe Island will be lost forever and at the same time seriously put into question project of this type and elsewhere		
August 2, 2006	• rumor has it that the WI wind project has been cancelled	August 2, 2006	• no truth to that rumour, continuing our development efforts with a target start date for construction in spring 2007
August 8, 2006	• will forward a siting diagram so that you can figure it into your plans, isn't there another public meeting planned to identify the actual turbine sites?	August 2, 2006	• next round of public open houses, one on WI and Kingston, will show the proposed locations of the turbines, access roads, power lines, will be sending out notices in advance of the POH and putting them up on the website, likely in the early autumn
Sept 26	• KH and RN spoke with stakeholder		Resident added to Project mailing list

Date	Comment	Date	Response
2006	• There is no formal association of the residents there at this point • Residents are very concerned about the viewshed and noise • He wants residents to get reassurance about where the turbines will be placed, and what it will look like from their homes • Residents have some of the most expensive properties in the Cape Vincent area • Since the project is in Ontario, not the U.S., residents are concerned about not having "a say" • RN offered to place him on the mailing list for the project to be notified of future events • He said that would be very good. He will distribute the information to other residents.		
October 16/06	• lives on Wolfe Island and would like to clarify misinformation regarding wind turbines • how high are supporting structures • how long is each blade • any evidence available on impact of wind farms on nearby property values • belief that wind turbines are noisy • any reports or articles on noise that could be sent to GC	Nov 17/06 From Ross Keating	• Turbines are Siemens 2.3 MW units with a hub height of 80 m, and blade length of 45 m (rotor diameter including hub, of 93 m) • There have been numerous studies on the impact of turbines on land values, generally indicate no loss of value • MOE has strict guidelines on permissible sound levels for wind turbines, we are required to limit sound levels to 40 dbA as measured at receptors (homes)
Nov 6/06	• Industrial paints and coatings. RK has worked on many wind farms worldwide and wanted to know who the turbine manufacturers were for the project. KLH told RK that Siemens was the manufacturer.		No follow-up required
Nov 08/06	• called to see if we knew what accommodations would be used in Spring during the construction of the project. • is opening a Bed and Breakfast and wanted to know where people might stay. KH told her to send her an email with B&B information,		Information passed to CREC

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	and she would pass it along to CREC.		
Nov16/06	• based on discussions with Geoff Carnegie, please find enclosed 2 copies of the following: Wolfe Island Wind Project Wind Turbine Siting Area – presented at Township of Frontenac Islands public meeting on 24 Oct 2006 as part of their zoning by-law review		No response required
Nov 20/06	• Returning phone call from earlier this morning • MW is 1/5 the owner of a parcel of land on Wolfe Island and may be selling. She wants to know if there will be a turbine on the property before she decides to sell. The message had been passed on to Scott Hossie and then Mary Lee Keith from CHD who got in contact with her. • She had spoken to a gentleman several weeks ago (no name) and was told that meetings were going to be held during the weeks of Nov 6 and 13 to determine turbine layout. • She was told to call back after these meetings so she was calling to follow up on that. • KLH passed information on to Geoff Carnegie and CREC will be following up on this one.		Information passed to Geoff Carnegie
Nov 21/06	• Nov 20/06, Stantec staff met with residents of Simcoe Island: purpose was to follow-up on concerns expressed to Geoff Carnegie during Nov 15/06 meeting • In addition, accounts of wildlife observations were shared		• Stantec addressed each concern and addressed them by providing information and an explanation to the best of our knowledge. • The residents were informed that according to Stantec's best knowledge to date, no wind turbines were proposed to be on Simcoe Island
Nov 29, 2006	• Lapp Canada is a German company with a broad range of products and supply cables & connectors to major Turbine manufacturers such as GE and Vestas Canada. • I would like to meet in person to discuss his products	Nov 29, 2006	• thank you for your email. It has been forwarded to the developer, CREC, who will be making the decision on supply of product and material for the project.

Date	Comment	Date	Response
Nov 29, 06	• Please find enclosed a copy of the submissions (three in total) made to the Ministry of the Environment regarding the Wolfe Island Wind Project • #1 – Letter to Vicki Mitchell at MOE from Peggy Smith on behalf of OMB Appellant. • OMB Appellant prepared a report outlining his an ongoing project intended to protect and expand upon the waterfowl ecosystem in the southwestern area of Wolfe Island • The report was prepared for submission at the public meeting to consider a proposed Official Plan Amendment under sections 17 and 22 of the Planning Act, held on May 31, 2006. He was advised by Rob Nadolny, Senior Project Manager of Stantec Consulting Limited, that the meeting was not the proper setting for such a submission, but rather, that the report should be distributed directly to Mr. Nadolny for distribution and action • OMB Appellant has reviewed all of the material published to date regarding the comments and concerns raised by the residents of the Island with respect to the Wind Farm Project • There appears to be no record of or reference to this report • Therefore, we are submitting a copy directly to your attention, and ask for confirmation that this report will be given consideration in the preparation of the ESR • If you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact OMB Appellant directly • #2 – May 30, 2006 letter to Rob Nadolny from OMB Appellant summarized as follows • please find attached my response to the Proposed Official Plan Amendment which would permit the development of Commercial	20 Dec 2007	• <u>From Vicki Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment</u> • you have asked for confirmation that (your cleint's) report on the waterfowl ecosystem on Wolfe Island will be considered during preparation of the Environmental Screening Report • I have a copy of a June 20, 2006 letter from Rob Nadolny at Stantec to (your client), indicating that the information provided by (your client) will be considered as part of the Environmental Screening Process • I recommend that you contact the proponent of the project through their consultant to discuss (your cleint's) input on potential environmental impacts • The Environmental Screening Process is a proponent self-assessment process, which requires proponents to determine impacts to the environment and undertake public consultation • During the ESP, questions about the project and observations about potential environmental impacts should be directed to the proponent of the project • The proponent should consider the input received during the public and review agency consultation when evaluating environmental impacts and proposing mitigation measures of the Regional Ministry of the Environment (MOE) office • during the ESP is to provide technical comments on issues within our mandated areas of interest, such as noise impacts, and future approvals and permits that must be obtained under MOE legislation • the MOE is not involved in preparing the required project documentation, issuing notices, or undertaking public consultation for the project • the issue of impacts to waterfowl is not within the MOE's area of

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	Wind Farms on lands designated Agricultural on Schedule "A": to the Official Plan • attaching this in respect to our conversation regarding Wind Power Generation and anticipated wildlife impacts on Wolfe Island from the wind power generation which is of vital concern to a number of Wolfe Island Residents who care about the Island • Upon your recommendation, I am sending this letter to you outlining these concerns and ways to prevent action which would jeopardize important wildlife populations in the southwestern section of the Island, rather than submit it to the Meeting to Consider a Proposed Official Plan Amendment under Sections 17 and 22 of the Planning Act, May 31, 2006 for which it was originally intended respecting your role in the EA process • You indicated, this meeting is not the proper setting for such a submission but rather I should forward the letter directly to you for the distribution and action • Common sense does not accept that wildlife mortality is similar in extent to highway death and injuries, office tower impact, and like the small wind power generator in downtown Toronto that has been used in the past to placate concerns • The area of Wolfe island has specific locations with dense concentrations of waterfowl over extended periods of time on a daily basis which because of their behaviour and numbers are particularly vulnerable to the turbines • The issues that I have referred to in my letter are of increasing concern on Wolfe island • This should be an opportunity for the company to demonstrate sound environmental practices consistent with conservation ethos expressed by wind energy producers • #3 – May 30, 2006 letter from OMB Appellant to Council of		expertise, but can be of interest to the Ministry of Natural Resources or Environment Canada • the proponent may wish to share or discuss the information in (your client's) report with these review agencies, as part of the body of information that will be circulated to these agencies for review • if concerns have not been resolved through he ESP and adequately addressed in the final documentation, then a member of the public has the opportunity to write to the MOE Director of Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch and request an elevation of the project to an Individual Environmental Assessment

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	Corporation - Township of Frontenac Islands (to see summarized letter, please see 30 May 2006) • Provides educational background in waterfowl management, and wetland and waterfowl research • In early 1970s, recognized the unique nature of southwestern area of Wolfe Island, a special waterfowl ecosystem • In order to preserve and enhance this special habitat, I acquired critical properties containing farm and wetland and have continued to do so • I have been assisted by local landowners in different ways leading to the protection of populations of waterfowl including Mallards, Black Ducks, Pintails, along with Canadian and Snow Geese which use the adjacent protected harbour as refuge from weather and staging areas • The project was further recognized by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Canadian Wildlife Service in the 1970's who designated the adjacent lake area as protected and placed no hunting signage throughout • This remained the only protected area on Wolfe Island for years – increasing numbers of waterfowl have come to this general area fanning out in feeding forays across the entire western end of Wolfe Island foraging in great numbers in certain regions making it a particularly unique feature on the Island • Recognized that this particular region is highly attractive to Mallards and Black Ducks making it one of the most populous in Eastern Canada for these and other species which include Raptors which in turn interact with the waterfowl population • Ducks and Geese remain in this area for extended periods sometimes wintering as in 2006. As an example, throughout the fall and winter of 2005 and 2006 considerable concentrations of		

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	Mallards, Black Ducks, Pintails and Canada Geese as well as many other species such as Green-winged Teal, numbering from four to six thousand birds were continuously present through March and April when there was further significant recruitment as additional numbers arrived during spring migration • These are not just birds in the midst of migration with only temporary association with the region, but this waterfowl population remains in very large numbers leading to their expected interaction with injury and death to turbines • Should not be construed as occasional random collisions or even the greater interaction expected of migration but large numbers of ducks and geese continuously moving over extended periods often at times of poor visibility and even at night and thus vulnerable to impacts with the turbines on a continuous basis • Overflights begin in the south shore from where they pass over adjacent properties at variable altitudes anywhere from 20 to 200 metres, with the heavies concentrations between 30 and 50 metres • Birds move continuously in large flocks (thousands) and in smaller groups particularly during periods of inclement weather and windy conditional when visibility and maneuverability is poor increasing their likelihood of collision with the moving parts of wind turbines • In recognition of this unique situation, I have personally forgone the financial returns of wind turbines on my property since to do otherwise would be unconscionable given the expected interaction but these waterfowl need protection beyond as I have indicated • Clear that the positioning of wind power turbines in this general region will have a devastating impact on waterfowl flocks more so near the lake and up to 6 to 10 km inland and may be particularly damaging to already declining species such as Black Ducks which are particularly attracted to this region		

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	• Would be a serious mistake and simply irresponsible to place wind turbines in their flight paths undermining the overall intent of wind power, that is to provide energy as a means of conservation but at minimal cost to the environment • My land and others adjacent to proposed projects has been dedicated to wildlife enhancement including hedgerows which act as critical corridors for other wildlife species to access feeding areas from cover and returning, as well as providing important food for these animals • There must be adequate cover in these hedgerows to be effective for this purpose • Disturbance of hedgerows by newly constructed roadways would seriously impact this important element of the ecosystem. Turbines and access to turbines must be substantially away from these hedgerows • Wind power may be a contribution to energy needs, but it must be in the context of sound relationships with the environment • It's not a question of placement and later removal, if certain sites are unsuitable, but recognition of sensitive lands and protecting them from the start • Mistakes will require very expensive mitigation. Sitings of the units must be based on sound current information so that particularly sensitive ecosystems may be protected • No matter where wind power generators are positioned on Wolfe Island, there will be important negative impacts including bird collisions during migration as well as other expected wildlife contacts including their disappearance in the area near the generators • Some areas identified as particularly susceptible must be protected requiring that wind tower not be sited in these locations		

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	• Otherwise the remarkable ecosystem unique to Wolfe Island will be lost forever and at the same time seriously put into question project of this type and elsewhere		
03 Dec 2006	• Letter to Vicki Mitchell at MOE, Stantec was copied • Numerous windmills shortly will be erected on Wolfe Island and in light of this fact I would like to express my concern regarding one aspect of these mechanisms • Appears that the MOE has not asked for any exploration or address of the effects of noise emitted by these machines, and the resulting effect(s) on all living matter • Now, with one well publicized complaint that has emerged from New Brunswick on this very subject, due to my own sensitive hearing, I ask the MOE to now have this matter investigated • Wolfe Island, for the most part, has little noise pollution. • If one lives outside the Village of Marysville as I do, a car or tractor can be heard kilometres away. • A boat or plane passing by or over my home causes a startled reaction • The thought that there will be dozens of these giants staggered around my end of the Island has me wondering what will happen to my quality of life • As one who is charged with ensuring the wellbeing of all Ontarians, your cooperation in this regard would be most appreciated		• <u>From Vicki Mitchell, MOE (20 December 2006)</u> • thank you for your December 3, 2006 letter to me regarding your concerns about noise impacts from the proposed Wolfe Island Wind Plant • I have also received a copy of a December 18, 2006 letter from Kara Hearne at Stantec to you – provided background information on the requirements for noise assessment, and copies of relevant guidelines • Received the requested nose assessment earlier this month, and have forwarded it to our Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch, Air Approvals section, for their review • Once their review is complete, I will forward MOE comments to the consultants and Mr. Geoff Carnegie • As Ms. Hearne indicated in her letter, the noise assessment will be included as part of the ERR • Standard practice to also include copies of correspondence from review agencies in the ERR appendices, including comments on technical studies circulated before the ERR is finalized • In addition to providing information on noise impacts as part of the ESP, the proponent must obtain a Certificate of Approval (Air) under section 9 of the Environmental Protection Act prior to constructing the project • A Certificate of Approval would only be issued if the MOE is satisfied that the proposal meets MOE nose level criteria • <u>From Stantec (18 December 2006)</u> • While Stantec has yet to complete ESP for WI Wind Project, noise

Date	Comment	Date	Response
			emissions are an integral part of ERR • Project must comply with noise requirements from MOE • An ENIA is being prepared for the project, and will assess the potential effects of the Project on environmental noise levels at receptors. This document is submitted to the MOE for technical review and approval prior to its inclusion in the ERR, and will be available as part of ERR for stakeholder review and comment • MOE guidelines fro wind turbines to which project must adhere are most stringent for Class 3 receptors, it is anticipated that the Project will fall under Class 3 • Attached to letter is Applying MOE NPC Technical Publications to Wind Turbine Generators, and relevant NPC Technical Publications, and MOE's Frequently Asked Questions for Wind Turbine Project for continued reference
Dec 01/06	• KLH called to give a project update • KH reconfirmed that the major concern was the viewshed; what the turbines were going to look like. He agreed. • KH said that we are undertaking a visual change assessment for the project, and explained what that meant (we are doing modeling from vantage points so that people will be able to see what we expect the project will look like from that point). • KH told him that based on their concerns and our previous conversations; we have added two vantage points from the U.S. into the assessment (Cape Vincent and Tibbets Point). • He said that that was really responsive of us, he is impressed and happy that this is being done. • KH explained the current timeline for the project; that we are hoping to have a Public Open House sometime in the new year, we are		No follow-up required

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	hoping for January. He will receive notification when the date is finalized. • He said thank you very much.		
Dec 06/06	• has property on Wolfe Island, called to ask some general questions • called to clarify Stantec's role in the project, and to clarify the terminology used for the environmental reporting for the project. • KH explained that we are doing the environmental assessment work for the project, which includes both provincial and federal processes, and that we'll be producing one report that will cover off the requirements for the Environmental Review Report and the Environmental Impact Statement. • explained that his major concern was that the construction timeline was slated to start in spring 2007; thought he might have missed the release of the Environmental Review Report. • KH assured him that the report had not yet been released, and further, that although construction is scheduled to begin in spring 2007, that it cannot begin until the report had gone through its 30-day review period, and that permitting requirements would have to be met after that. KH will place him on the contact list for the project, so he will receive notification of the next round of Public Open Houses, and the commencement of the 30-day review period. • Thanked KH, will call if there are any other questions.		Stakeholder added to contact list
Dec 13/06	• Noticed on the website that another contact for the project, for CREC, is Geoff Carnegie • Called to get GC's phone number • KLH provided AB with GC's phone number		No follow-up required
Dec 15/06	• Manufacturers of anchor bolts • Have supplied anchor bolts for turbines on other wind project and		Passed information to CREC

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	wanted to know if specifications were available yet • KLH promised to pass on contact information to CREC		
January 2/07	• she believed we had been speaking with her husband, • called to see if a date had been set for the Public Open House • KLH said no • KLH explained that the noise impact assessment is currently being reviewed by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and until that report is approved, the turbine layout cannot be considered "finalized" and that we wont be going to a Public Open House until we have the turbine layout • asked if KLH could call her when a date is set, KLH agreed and also mentioned that they would receive a notification in the mail		Called to inform stakeholder of dates of Public Open House
Jan 3/07	• <u>Letter to Eric Boysen, Ministry of Natural Resources</u> • counsel for stakeholder, who has filed an appeal of a zoning by-law passed by the Township of Frontenac Islands for the development of the WI wind farm project • we have been advised that the issue of potential impact to waterfowl is within your jurisdiction and that the information provided by (client) could be circulated to your agency for review by the proponent • By copy of this letter, we are requesting that the proponent confirm that this information has been shared, and will be given due consideration	Feb 14 2007	• Information passed to Katie Griffiths, MNR • Stantec received a copy of a letter sent to Eric Boysen at MNR's Peterborough office by Peggy Smith dated January 3, 2007 • Attached a pdf of this letter in case this correspondence did not make it's way to you • Although correspondence from the public is considered during the ESP, and isn't normally forwarded to agencies prior to release of the EA report, I have also attached (client's) original correspondence to Stantec, as per the request in the January 2007 letter to the MNR • For your continued reference, Stantec responded to (client's) original letter in June, 2006. Attached it to this email to round out correspondence.
Jan 3/07	• <u>Letter to John Fischer, Canadian Wildlife Service</u> • counsel for stakeholder, who has filed an appeal of a zoning by-law passed by the Township of Frontenac Islands for the development		Correspondence from the public is not normally forwarded to agencies prior to the release of the EA

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	of the WI wind farm project • we have been advised that the issue of potential impact to waterfowl is within your jurisdiction and that the information provided by (client) could be circulated to your agency for review by the proponent • By copy of this letter, we are requesting that the proponent confirm that this information has been shared, and will be given due consideration		
Jan 5/07	• Invited her to January 2007 Sunny Acres Community Meeting • Scheduled a pre-meeting on Jan 25/07 11:00am • They met on Jan 25/07 11:00am-12:30pm at Tim Horton's, Portsmouth, provided detailed project binder		No response necessary
Jan 5/07	• Forwarded invitation to January 2007 Sunny Acres Community Meeting		No response necessary
Jan 5/07	• Forwarded invitation to January 2007 Sunny Acres Community Meeting	Jan 5/07 6:45	• Returned call, CREC answered questions
Jan 5/07	• Called to invite to January 2007 Sunny Acres Community Meeting		No response necessary
Jan 5/07	• Invited to January 2007 Sunny Acres Community Meeting, thankful, will get a ride to the meeting, thankful for invite		No response necessary
Jan 5/07	• Invited to January 2007 Sunny Acres Community Meeting • Living at daughter's house now, renovating, if he does not get hand delivered invite, he will call me back		No response necessary
Jan 5/07	• Invited to January 2007 Sunny Acres Community Meeting • Appreciates invite/offer • Didn't get hand delivered invite		No response necessary
Jan 15/07	• invitation to January 2007 Sunny Acres Community Meeting,		No response necessary

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	includes brief description of project, and what the meeting is about		
Jan 15/07	• invitation to Jan 2007 community meeting, includes brief description of project, and what the meeting is about		No response necessary
January 18/07	• had just received his invitation to the community meeting • wanted to know if there would be a formal Q&A session • KLH told him no, there would be a presentation, followed by an informal Q&A period where several reps from CREC and Stantec would be available to ask questions • requested a formal Q&A session • KLH said she would pass it on to study team, but that in her experience informal Q&As are more effective b/c more people are able to ask their questions • was concerned about proposed route: along sunny acres, and the site of the waterfront cable –although outside Paterson Park, and on private property, said this is the area most used for recreational purposes. KLH told that this information would be passed on to the study team – the route had been chosen outside of Patterson park specifically to address the concerns of residents and users of the park • believe that CREC will find an excuse for having the transmission line overhead; he does not believe that CREC plans on putting it underground. has no trust in CREC and what they say • KLH said that she understood his position, but that it is most certainly planned to be underground and there are absolutely no plans for the line to be overhead • further believes that the Carruthers Point route was never really considered, that it was presented to the public just so that CREC could say they examined that option; believes that the route was always planned for the sunny acres road area. KLH assured PB		Passed stakeholder's concerns to study team

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	that the Carruthers • Point route had been very seriously considered, and it has been a recent project development that the proposed route come back to the Sunny Acres area • KLH promised to pass concerns on to the study team		
January 25/07	• wanted to make sure you were aware we're having a community meeting next week, see attached, I've also forwarded this to Peter Kraus • had a meeting with Councilor Hector and she suggested I touch base with you regarding the Wolfe Island Wind Project in particular our work on the mainland • as part of our ERR we have commissioned an Economic Impact and Benefits Study		No response required
Feb 7/07	• KH received e-mail • asked for Canadian Hydro contact – Asked Rob to contact him, or pass his info along to proper contact	Feb 7/07	• e-mail from Rob Miller re: tender packages fro construction • gave Cal Christenson contact information
Feb 14/07	• called to suggest meeting with WAG as a group, to learn issues, questions, curiosities etc. • suggested between March 5-9 • she said she'd see if she could set up meeting then and call back to my cell		No response required
Feb 26/07	• left complete message asking for meeting with whole WAG group to share their questions, curiosities, views etc. and to offer details and info regarding project, to have good open dialogue, sometime between March 5 & 9th.	Feb 27/07	• would not consider our having a WAG meeting without her being present made it clear that WAG is not a wind group
March 9/07	• Has home on Simcoe Island, was hoping for an update on development plans for wind farm	March 9	• At this time, no layout of project posted on website, still working to refine layout

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	• Has looked at all web info, but can't find anything that actually shows located of individual birds • Plans on attending POH in March • Believes at one point there was a possibility for turbines on Simcoe, was wondering what Simcoe component would be		• Will have layout at POH • No wind turbines are planned for Simcoe Island
March 12, 2007	• Called to find out when contracts for construction were going to be released. KH explained that Canadian Projects Ltd. would be determining that, and provided information for Rob Miller, who could answer his questions, or direct him to appropriate person who could.		No response required
March 12, 2007	• Left message: VanBots Construction is general contractor from Markham		• KH called back and left message
March 12, 2007	• Left message • She and her husband are landowners on WI, hoping to build a house this year • Were on the Island past week, and discovered that the wind turbines are not going to be on one peninsula, as they had originally been told by one of local residents • Heard there are going to be 2 turbines quite close to proposed building site • Attracted to island because it is so quiet • Have been reading up on wind turbines, now very concerned about potential noise – she also sent an e-mail, please read her e-mail and call them back	March 20/07	• KH called her to inform her that we received her voice message and e-mail last week • Asked for legal description of her property so we can formulate a response that is specific to her • probably wont be attending POH because she lives in Toronto • would really like to see turbine layout • visited Melancthon wind plant, didn't like the look of the turbines • KH explained that Stantec has prepared visual simulations of the turbines to show people what the project will look like once constructed – a sample of these simulations will be presented at POH • KH got home address so she could be added to contact list • responding to e-mail and voice message

Date	Comment	Date	Response
			• Stantec sent follow-up letter on 26 March 2007 • We are in receipt of your email and voice message, which outlines your inetest in the Project • We understand from reading your email that you have the following four key concerns: turbine layout, municipal and environmental turbine setbacks, environmental noise, turbine lighting • In response to your queries the information below is provided • Based upon the current layout – the closest proposed turbine to your property is approximately 1.5 km away • Turbine layout: 86 turbines planned for the Project will be placed throughout the western portion of Wolfe Island • Access roads associated with the turbines will be located on lands owned by participating landowners, and will be sited in consultation with those landowners • Proposed turbines are new, 2.3 MW generators. These are a modern design that reduces or eliminates many of the concerns associated with older models of turbines, as you described in your correspondence • Municipal and Environmental Turbine Setbacks: Township of Frontenac Islands has completed the public process of approving an Official Plan Amendment (OPA) and Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBL) for the Project – these documents are attached for your reference • The ZBL distinguishes between lands where the owner has agreed to host wind plan infrastructure by signing an option agreement with CREC, defined as a 'participating' landowner, and

Date	Comment	Date	Response
			those who have not agreed to host wind plant infrastructure, defined as 'non-participating' landowner • Property of participating landowners is referred to as a WP Zone in the ZBL – map of WP Zone is attached in the ZBL • ZBL specifies that the minimum setback distance of a wind turbines from lands in any zone other than a WP Zone or Village Residential zone (Marysville) is the length of blade (45 metres) plus 4 metres. • Important to note that the ZBL setbacks represent minimum that will be applied to the Project • Other environmental factors, such as MOE environmental noise guidelines, as well as setbacks to wetlands and watercourses, can combine to result in greater sertbacks • Environmental Noise: MOE requires the Project demonstrate compliance with its environmental noise guidelines (Interpretation for Applying NPC Technical Publications to Wind Turbine Generators) • This guideline indicates that for wind speeds 6 m/s or less, in a Rural Area during the nighttime, sound levels at receptors should be 40 dB(A) or the minimum background sound level established pre-project, whichever is higher • To demonstrate compliance with these requirements, an Environmental Noise Impact Assessment (ENIA) has been prepared for the Project • The ENIA will assess the potential effects of the Project on environmental noise levels at receptors, the MOE defines residential dwellings or residences as receptors

Date	Comment	Date	Response
			• CREC must comply with all regulatory requirements. Consistent with the MOE's review process, the ENIA is currently undergoing MOE technical review, which is preferred prior to its inclusion in the ERR. • Turbine Lighting: Transport Canada – Aviation (TC) is the federal agency responsible for wind turbine lighting and marking requirements • The Project must comply with the aviation safety lighting and marking standards specified by TC as set out in the Canadian Aviation Regulations and Standards • TC has been developing new standards for wind turbines and has asked project developers to consider the new draft standards in their project planning • Based on the current standards, CREC expected only 31 of the 83 turbines may require an aviation safety light on top of the tower • Final determination will be made by TC • Regardless of the final number of turbines requiring lighting, CREC synchronize all lights to flash simultaneously to avoid the potential for a strobing effect • Upcoming Open House: attached for your information is the notice for the upcoming Public Open Houses for the Project.
March 13, 2007	• Left message letting them know POH dates have been set, provided the dates. They should be receiving, or have received, an invitation with the details in the mail • call back if need any more details		No response required
March 13, 2007	• Will also send e-mail to webmail • Works on the Energy Committee for the Consumers Council of	March 16/07	• thank you for pointing out nameplate capacity issue – we will correct this

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	Canada • Notice said the project will generate 198 MW, but that it will only deliver 30% of that. Has no objection to the project, but thinks the public should understand that it is only 30% • He may submit a letter to the newspapers to inform the public of these issues • He understands that Stantec would only have general information, not the detail he's looking for about terms and conditions of CREC's contract with the government • KLH mentioned there would be many representatives from CREC at the POHs that would know the detailed information he is looking for. He said he is elderly, and not well and wont be attending the POH • KLH will pass his information on to a representative at CREC who will call him back		• all of details pertaining to renewable energy supply contacts and renewable energy requests for proposals are on the Ontario Power Authority's website • OPA will not release individual contract details • The ISEO buys and sells power, their website has historical data and power price records • Ontario's electricity pricing is volatile, and the price is expected to rise in the future – we believe a benefit of wind power is that it provides stable long term pricing • We have signed a contract with OPA that is essentially fixed
March 13, 2007	• Are the speckles on the Notice locations for turbines? • KLH said no, just part of map • wanted to know if there were gong to be turbines in Big Sandy Bay Wetland, KLH said no, there are setbacks from sensitive features like wetlands • asked if the turbine locations would be available at the Public Open House, KLH said yes • He is supportive of the project		No response required
March 13/07	• Thanks for e-mail of your upcoming Public Open House • Will attend March 28 POH • Has been following project for sometime. In past, has worked for Stantec as an underwater inspector several times on Parkhill Bridge	14 March 2007	• Glad to hear that you'll be joining us on the 28th. • The work you do sound very interesting – I have passed the information on to CHD and Canadian Projects Limited., who will be making decisions about the hiring of services for the Project

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	Project • Can supply following services for this project: • Professional diving services • Underwater and land based archaeological assessment services • Underwater Klein Side Scan Surveying and Remote Operated Vehicles Video Inspections of the Supply Cable • Supply Barge and Tug boat services to transport equipment		
March 14, 2007	• lives in Kingston, but originally from Denmark • would love to see project come true • has seen how much good windmills can do – at home, floors and water is heated by windmills • unable to attend POH, which is why she wanted to make comments now		No response required
March 16/07	• received notice, supports project completely • left contact info in case she can sign a petition, whatever she can do to help • KH called back to thank her for the comments – she asked if there was anything she can do to support project • KH said her phone call was exactly what she can do, all of the comments will be included as part of the ESP and positive comments show the Project team and stakeholder reviewers that there is community support for the project • She will try to get to Public Open House		No response required
March 16/2007	• Appreciated speedy response to his e-mail • The better consumers understand, the better off we'll be • Was not aware that our generation is being exported, there was a misconception that we would be providing generation to WI		No response necessary

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	• Explained difference between distribution and transmission • Stakeholder said that anytime we want or need comment (to support the Project) he'd be happy to respond • Thanked him		
March 21, 2007	• EIS can be obtained from:www.ppmenergy.com/horsecreek • Contact me if you have anymore questions		No response necessary
March 22, 07	• Received notice, lives near boundary of mainland study area • unable to attend Public Open House • looking at study area boundary, wondered why that particular portion of Kingston was included – curious if it had anything to do with noise from project catching only that portion of study area • KLH explained that it was where the mainland transmission line is proposed to be routed • He said that was very good, thank you		No response necessary
March 23/07	• sent reminder notice and invitation for Canadian Hydro Developer's Public Open House • purpose of Public Open House is to address stakeholder and community comments • we welcome your attendance and support for the Project as leaders of the community		No response necessary
March 23/07	• sent reminder notice and invitation for Canadian Hydro Developer's Public Open House • purpose of Public Open House is to address stakeholder and community comments • we welcome your attendance and support for the Project as leaders of the community		No response necessary
March	• sent reminder notice and invitation for Canadian Hydro Developer's		No response necessary

Date	Comment	Date	Response
23/07	Public Open House • purpose of Public Open House is to address stakeholder and community comments • we welcome your attendance and support for the Project as leaders of the community		
March 23/07	• Is a filmmaker, doing documentary on Project • Planned to be done over time, with some footage now, then during construction, then a few years later during operation • Wondering if we'd have any objection to him filming Public Open House next week • KLH passed info on to CREC who would contact him		Passed information to CREC
March 23/07	• Thanks for the invitation; however I have other meetings both nights. Keep me informed.	March 23/07	• No problem, thanks for reply. I live in Kingston so feel free to call if you have any questions.
March 23/07	• Will not be able to attend meeting, has a board meeting that same time.	March 23/07	• No problem, thanks for reply. I live in Kingston so feel free to call if you have any questions.
March 24/07	• Will contact CHD in late April for WAG meeting details of discussion follow: • Claims we don't communicate with community to allow public opportunity to express to us and participate landowners, how they feel • She is curious to know why we arbitrarily chose to ignore the public regarding setbacks, health, safety, lifestyle impact, when we planned the project • A meeting would be a good thing however WAG is not really a group but rather a platform for people to express and learn		No response required
March 24/07	• Will not be able to make it to Public Open House, from announcement, it appears these meetings will solicit public input.	March 25/07	• Still consulting with stakeholders and collecting and analyzing their input • While I cannot speak about the NY experience, I can provide

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	• Will there be new information presented from the developers? • My wife and I are not encouraged by setback guidelines we have seen so far • Has up-close experience with turbines at Maple Ridge wind farm here in upstate New York • Noise and negative visual impact is strongly prohibitive for residential development • Very hesitant to start building on Reeds Bay road until we know where turbines will be sited • Is there proposed siting plan available for public review?		some background on municipal setbacks and environmental noise as addressed in Ontario • Municipal setbacks: were established by the Township of Frontenac Islands after more than two years of consideration and review • Setbacks are similar to those established in other Ontario municipalities and represent "minimums"; in most instances the project facilities are at greater distances • While applying the municipal setbacks, the project must also balance environmental setbacks from such features as wetlands and watercourses • We believe the Council has passed municipal setbacks that are appropriate and balanced for the Island • Environmental noise: MOE ahs established guidelines specific to wind turbine generators; the project must comply with these guidelines • To demonstrate compliance at this stage of the Project • a detailed review of potential noise effects is undertaken and document in an ENIA- which is then submitted to the MOE for their review • following this review, if the MOE agrees the project as planned can meet the guidelines, they issue a letter in this regard
March 25/07	• What is the date and time of Public Open House?	March 25/07	• Kingston date is Wednesday March 28, 6:00 – 8:00pm, Wolfe Island date March 27/07 6-9 at Sacred Heart Catholic School • Attachment was a PDF of the POH Notice that was in the newspaper
March 25 2007	• Will review information resources before submitting comments		No response required

Date	Comment	Date	Response
March 26/07	• received Notice of Public Open House, lives in mainland study area • she and her husband are shift workers, wondered if they should take time off work to go to Public Open House, wanted information • wondered if project would affect their electricity service • KLH said electricity will be injected into grid, so no, wont affect their service • KLH explained mainland transmission line route, she was pleased that it will be underground • Thanked KLH very much for information, will try to come to Public Open House		No response required
March 26/07	• has been copied on an email regarding Public Open House for Wolfe Island Wind Project • will move from Calgary to Kingston in May has not attended initial open houses • contacted KLH last fall regarding transmission line routing before purchasing a home in proximity to Sunny Acres Road • concern was the routing of transmission line, was advised at the time that preliminary transmission line touting had the line coming ashore between Sand Bay and Cataraqui Bay, east of DuPont running due north to Front Road, if this is still the routing of choice, will have no issues with venture • please advice to status of routing	April 2/07	• the proposed Carruthers Point route was presented at the POH in March 2006, and was preliminary preferred route at time of your previous correspondence • continuing project evaluation activities have resulted in CREC having to return to the original alignment parallel to Sunny Acres Road – acknowledging concerns of community, transmission line will be placed underground • a meeting was held on January 20/07 with local residents to discuss this modification to the mainland transmission line route • display boards were presented at community meeting are available on project website
March 28 2007	• Power from wind is more costly than from other sources, what are true economic costs to consumers? • Research indicates that there will be significant environmental impacts. Turbines increase wind speed, temperature and evaporation at ground level. What are the implications for local ecology and biodiversity?	May 1, 2007	• Thank you for taking the time to attend the POH • In response to comments you submitted via letter to project representatives, the following information is provided: • Project Economics: Project is a private development CREC and all associated economic risks are the sole responsibility of CREC. No economic costs including taxes associated with the construction and operation of the Project will be passed onto local residents.

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	• Birds will be affected, the siting is along one of the major bird migration routes in Ontario • Property values will likely drop. • Noise levels are a major concern and well documented in areas where wind turbines currently exist • Health issues caused by proximity to turbines are a major concern • Before any further advancement of this project, I propose there be: rigorous env'l health and safety assessments conducted by appropriate ministries, provincial regulations established and adhered to regarding setbacks, an evaluation process to research the suitability of the proposed site which would include membership from communities affected by the wind turbine project and representation from all stakeholders		• In addition, CREC is investing approximately $410 million to construct and operate the Project, with numerous economic benefits to the community: creation of jobs; monies spent locally (estimated $64 million during construction); new source of taxation for Township (estimated $550,000/year paid by CREC); royalty payments made to participating landowners (estimated $1.2 million/year), Amenities Agreement with Township for community betterment initiatives ($645,000/year) • Wind energy provides stable, long-term fixed pricing - not subject to fuel price volatility • Wind energy is price competitive today, when compared to other forms of new generation and the expected life of wind turbines exceeds 25 years. • Ecology and Biodiversity**:** potential effects to natural environment and local biodiversity are being assessed as part of the ERR, includes: an assessment of potential effects to birds, bats, butterflies, wildlife, fish, etc. • Birds**:** comprehensive bird-monitoring program has been developed and implemented using guidance from Environment Canada/Canadian Wildlife Service- Bird studies conducted for the project include: habitat surveys, wintering raptors, spring waterfowl, spring migration, fall migration, breeding birds, and species at risk. These avian surveys have been ongoing on Wolfe Island since 2004. • Property Values**:** Based upon data reviewed to date in other areas with established wind plants (e.g., Canada, USA, Europe, and Australia), no material adverse effect to property values is anticipated as a result of the renewable energy project. • CREC commissioned property value review for Wolfe Island to incorporate local knowledge into this issue - this information will be included in the ERR -.provided link to property value studies • Tourism**:** tourism impact assessment is being conducted as part of

Date	Comment	Date	Response
			ERR • anticipated effects of the Project on tourist industry of the area is not to be significant, either positively or negatively • Beyond initial interest in the wind farm, it is also anticipated that the community will become accustomed to commercial-scale wind turbines and their appearance • Noise: MOE requires the Project demonstrate compliance with its environmental noise guidelines. MOE environmental noise guidelines for wind turbines are available from MOE in their document entitled: Interpretation for Applying MOE NPC Technical Publications to Wind Turbine Generators (06 July 2004). • ENIA will assess the potential effects of Project on environmental noise levels at receptors • CREC must comply with all regulatory requirements. Consistent with the MOE's review process, ENIA is currently undergoing MOE technical review • Health Effects: Potential health effects associated with Project have been assessed as part of ERR for the Project. • effect of installing the various Project components is anticipated to have limited effect on public health and safety during construction or operation of facilities and Project will be designed, constructed and operated to ensure that it satisfies all applicable health and safety requirements. • Ministerial Assessment and Evaluation Process: ERR for Project is being prepared using a multidisciplinary team of specialists, according to and to be consistent with the Ministry of the Environment's ("MOE") *Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Electricity Projects* (March 2001) as mandated under Ontario Regulation 116/01, the Electricity Projects Regulation. Furthermore, the ERR will be consistent with the provisions of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* and the requirements identified in the Natural Resources Canada document *Environmental*

Date	Comment	Date	Response
			Impact Statement Guidelines for Screenings of Inland Wind Farms Under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (2003). A rigorous and comprehensive review will also be conducted by all relevant agencies and stakeholders upon the completion of the ERR • Setbacks: determined based on a number of factors- Township of Frontenac Islands ultimately decides minimum setback distances through the zoning process • In addition to zoning setbacks, the MOEt requires the project demonstrate compliance with its environmental noise guidelines – which also affects the distance of wind turbines from receptors (houses)-unlike zoning setbacks which tend to be a linear measured distance in metres, noise setbacks are determined based on sound levels at receptors (e.g., houses) as measured in a-weighted decibles. • important to note that the zoning bylaw setbacks represent the minimum that will be applied to the Project. Other environmental factors, such as MOE environmental noise guidelines, as well as setbacks to wetlands and watercourses, can combine to result in greater setbacks.
March 28/07	• Thanks for time last night at WI Public Open House • Presentation on wildlife and biological matters was very informative and complete with good rational and data for the conclusions • Plans to integrate 2004 study in Nature as part of urgent message to adopt renewable technologies • Will continue open houses here at home to demonstrate residential solar hot water, PV, and wind systems to reduce carbon load • Please advise if you feel it would be productive for employment purposes to send a resume and covering letter to Stantec or any of the other local contractors you work with • Would love to work with one of teams doing initial assessments and		No response required

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	follow-up		
Conversation with Geoff Carnegie at POH	• Thinks WTG 81 is too close to the northern property boundary and should be relocated deeper into the participating property owner's property – he has a pond in the back corner of his abutting property where they like to duck hunt	22 May 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the WI wind project • All information presented at POH is now available on project website • Siting turbines is a balancing task, considering many factors such as: available/participating land base, wind speed and direction, environmental features (woodlands and watercourses), municipal requirements(setbacks to property lines and roads) and environmental noise. • We have evaluated your request for a potential shift of wind turbine #81, proposed to be located south of your property. Due to potential for increased environmental noise levels at non-participating residences, above those permitted by the MOE, along with consideration of wind direction and turbines spacing, we are unable to relocate this turbines. • Potential effects from the Project on waterfowl are being assessed as part of ESP • Data analysis is currently ongoing, in conjunction with EC and CWS, the final results will be presented in the ERR
29 March 2007	• left message • couldn't make it to Public Open Houses • wondered if it was possible to get comments and information that was available to the public		• KH called back and left message
March 30/07	• would like to submit further comments, but unable to see turbine simulations on website • please call on Monday regarding this		• not sure what is happening – working on my computer. They are pretty big files and take some times to download, if you're still having trouble, let me know and I'll e-mails them to your account
April 2/07	• visuals are coming up as blank PDF's on my screen	April 2/07	• not sure what is happening – working on my computer. They are pretty big files and take some times to download, if you're still

Date	Comment	Date	Response
			having trouble, let me know and I'll e-mails them to your account
April 2/07	• don't think it's a loading/timing problem, since I minimized a couple documents and went back some time later and still blank PDF document • not sure how to check on e-mail limitations – should be ok if you want to send them	April 2/07	• have a coworker having same problem, said hitting 'Refresh' made display boards pop up • try that, if it doesn't work, I'll send you simulation boards
April 2/07	• reduced image size and hit refresh, it worked	April 2/07	• good to hear, if you have any other questions or difficulties accessing website material, let me know
April 2 2007	• Stantec send stakeholder information on WI Monarchs		No response required
April 2, 2007	• wants diagram showing what 40db looks like relative to other sources of noise, and wants to know turbine dimensions	April 2, 2007	• Find enclosed two pages relating directly to your inquiries: one diagram shows typical noise levels found around us every day and how a wind turbine would compare, the next shows general dimensions of a wind turbine
April 2/07	• CBC Radio had questions about the project • KLH explained that we do not have media contact, directed them to that contact information		No response required
April 2/07	• emailed KH on March 30/07 to say that visual simulations were not on website yet	April 2, 07	• KH called her to say that simulations were not on website, so she should be able to access them She said thank you
April 2/07	• landowner on Howe Island • Was having trouble downloading visual simulation on website on weekend • KLH attempted, had no problems • Weekend problem may have been solved • KLH said to call back if it still doesn't work and we'll figure out how		No response required

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	to get the files to him		
April 2/07	• appreciate your response • disconcerting that transmission line route has been modified since our last communication. I can envisage budgetary restrains impacting the current project plan further • is there agreement of all parties, at all levels, that the transmission line will be buried for its route adjacent to Sunny Acres Road?	April 3/07	• has received a lot of feedback on this issue, understands his concern • Jan meeting was held in recognition of how important the transmission line issue is • The ERR is being prepared on the basis that the transmission line will be buried
April 3/07	• called, left message • Was looking for an article about the WI WP POH that had been published in the Thousand Islands Sun • She would like to send this article to a bunch of people	April 3/07	• KLH called back, she had found the Notice published on the Project website, said it was almost verbatim what had been in the Thousand Islands Sun – will circulate it • She knows many people who go hunting in the area, she makes arrangements for them • She has been added to contact list and will personally receive notices from now on Next step is completion of EA report, will receive a Notice once is has been completed
April 3/07	• Thank you for your response, it alleviates my concerns to a certain degree • When government agencies and private enterprise attempt large scale project, bottom line tends to dictate project deliverables • If indeed the cable is buried, very supportive of implementation. Bats, on other hand, may disapprove – that is another issue • Will watch further developments with interest	April 4/07	• glad you found information useful, feel free to contact me if you have any other questions regarding mainland transmission line or ESP
April 6, 2007	• Copied Stantec to letter sent to John Gerresten, MPP • Concerned that "changes to Township of Frontenac Islands' Zoning By-laws and Official Plan Amendments were approved without full disclosure for public input" • Concerned that an amendment was made to the Official Plan prior	• April 25, 2007	• Response from Mayor Jim Vanden Hoek – wishing to respond to her letter to Mr. Gerresten, as published in the Whig Standard • both amendments had been made with full public disclosure and according to all procedural requirements of the Planning Act • outlined public consultation to date, the process of approving the

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	to the release of the ESR, when Council had "advised the public that the process would include an Environmental Screening Report" • Concerned that two member of Council representing WI declared a conflict of interest, yet passes the Amendment • concerned that she was not advised that turbines would be located in close proximity to her property, or that elected representatives would refrain from voting on the amendment • requesting that the Minister investigate possible non-compliance under the Municipal Act and Planning Act; and look into lack of process and conflict of interest by Council to conduct business without proper studies and full input from all tax payers		amendment, each individual councilor is responsible for determining if they comply with the Conflict of Interest Act • the municipality is preparing a site plan control by-law to adequately address all site considerations raised in the OP and zoning by-law • any lack of public participation has not been the result of lack of opportunity
April 7, 2007	• provides suggestions as to where the turbines should be placed	April 12, 2007	• Good afternoon – I trust you enjoyed some time with family and friends over the Easter break…too much snow were I was too!! • Thanks for the comments below and clustering concept as proposed in the attachment. We will continue to review all comments and suggestions put forward to further refine layout, which includes those below. With regard to the clustering concept, which focusing on the western portion of the Island we have tried to do, I note for continued reference that siting the wind turbines is definitely a balancing task, considering a multitude of items such as: available / participating land base, wind speed and direction, environmental features (e.g., woodlands and watercourses), municipal requirements (e.g., setbacks to property lines and roads), environmental noise (provincial guidelines), etc. • Well I see it is Thursday, so all the best for a great weekend!
April 12, 2007	• Represents rotary club of Gananoque • Their group is interested in project • Would like to have someone come down and vie a short		Passed information to CREC

Date	Comment	Date	Response
	presentation • KLH will pass info on to CREC		
April 16, 2007	Raising concerns they would like to see addressed in the ERR • Main concern is the setback distance from residents, schools and roads. WI setback is 350 m, but at some of CHD's other project sites, setbacks are 1 or 2 km. Important that special consideration be given to those residents who do not want wind turbines on their property. Would like the following issues addressed: • Setback distances: demonstrate and support with scientific reference, how CHD has arrived at the setback distance of 350 m. Justify using different setback distances in other wind projects currently in existence. • Noise Pollution: please address health concerns that can arise from noise created by the wind turbines. Literature suggests turbines can cause vertigo, tinnitus, and difficulties concentrating. • Pollution during building of the turbines: if wells are affected by silt build-up or other problems, what plans have been made for remediation of this problem. What plans are being made to mitigate the effects of cement production on WI during the construction phase of the Project? • Visual pollution from lights that blink all day and night • Visual pollution from the transformative effect of so many turbines in such a small area. The simulative views of WI show an eerily science-fiction like horizon. The new 'look' will mean dropping property values, people may be intrigued but they will not want to buy land or houses anywhere on WI	June 6, 2007	• Due to the high level of community interest in this renewable energy initiative, Canadian Renewable Energy Corporation ("CREC") has made the harmonized Environmental Review Report / Environmental Impact Statement ("EA") available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment. • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA, beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's • commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence :Setbacks, Environmental Noise, Health and Safety, Surface Water, Groundwater, Turbine Lighting, Visual Change, Property value • As the Wolfe Island Wind Project proceeds, we will notify you of future activities. • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007.

Date	Comment	Date	Response
April 17, 2007	• Granted a permission to access property for waterfowl study		No response required
April 17, 2007	• Granted a permission to access property for waterfowl study		No response required
April 19, 2007	• Has a client considering purchasing a property on Wolfe Island • He asked her if there was a map showing where the turbines are going to be • KLH directed her to website, where there is the Project layout available as one of the display boards presented at the recent Open House. • KLH also explained that in the Common Documents section, there are some studies about property values and wind plants posted that he could look at for more information. • If there are any problems downloading this material, just call back and KLH will email them.		No response required
April 23, 2007	• Mailed Emails she had originally sent to webmail March 29th, and 31st, had yet to receive official response to her questions	May 1, 2007	• Thank you for comments on POH • Sent information regarding obtaining documents and project status, noise, turbine lighting, vibrations, generators, water wells, ferry impact, property value, increased number of turbines
April 30, 2007	• Please to provide Valerie Wyatt copies of the Big Sandy Bay Interim Management Statement dated March 1988 and the Life Science Survey and Evaluation of the Big Sandy Bay ANSI • We are anxiously awaiting the ERR, please provide a copy of the report to us when it's released	June 6, 2007	• Due to the high level of community interest in this renewable energy initiative, has made the Draft EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment. • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA, beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP. • Provided list of locations where Draft EA could be viewed • As the Wolfe Island Wind Project proceeds, we will notify you of future activities. • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by

Date	Comment	Date	Response
			Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007.
May 1, 2007	• Request to Rescind Rezoning By-Law from Wolfe Island Residents for the Environment • Comments: there are many health concerns to be addressed that need to be included in the environmental scan that have not been researched in detail • There are numerous sites in the province that would be much more appropriate that are not near residences or schools		• No response required
May 1, 2007	• Request to Rescind Rezoning By-Law from Wolfe Island Residents for the Environment • Comments: re-zoning should not have been done ahead of the environmental assessment • Why is this company pushing this through so quickly • Contrary to the report in the Whig Standard that "all of Wolfe Island" is behind this, I have talked to more people that are against this than for. • This needs to be rolled back so that it can go through the proper process for the 'community' other than a handful of people		• No response required

1.1.3 Comment Cards March 2006 Public Open House

Date	Comments Received	Response
Mar 22 Open House	• Why is the Province paying 42cents/ kWH for solar vs. 11 cents for wind?	• The government has set a standard price in its recently release Standard Offer Contract that will make it easier for entrepreneurs and businesses to sell clean power from different types of small renewable energy projects to the grid. An increased price for solar power is reflective of the additional costs of equipment and materials associated with this technology. • More information about the Standard Offer Contract can be obtained from the Ministry of Energy's website at www.energy.gov.on.ca
	• What will the impact be on our skyrocketing energy bill?	• The price consumers pay for electricity is set by the Government of Ontario based on many different cost factors such generation, transmission, distribution, debt retirement, and electrical losses, among others. • The Wolfe Island Wind Project will generate a clean, renewable supply of electricity at a competitive price over its 20-year Renewable Energy Supply Contract period and beyond. During the 20-year period the price of electricity sold from the project is essentially fixed, so the project will assist the Government in establishing long-term stable prices for electricity.
Mar 22 Open House	• looks like a good project • I look forward to having it up and running	• Standard Letter
Mar 22 Open House	• I am very concerned about the environmental impact of these windmills • Our great concerns include the following: living on a 1 acre lot at the corner of Baseline & the 5th Concession we forEsee windmills will go up all around our property and neighbourhood. • How can we be assured that this windmill project will not: – Cause our **property value** to drop	• Property evaluation studies carried out in the U.S., Australia, and Europe, where wind turbines are more common, generally indicate that the installation of such facilities has no material adverse effect to property values. • Since there are no known Canadian studies on property value, Canadian Hydro Developers, Inc., the parent company of CREC, retained an independent Appraiser to review property transactions in Melancthon Township (Dufferin County), where they recently constructed a wind plant. The review was carried out for the period of time defined as November 2004 (i.e., when Canadian Hydro was awarded a RES Contract for the facility) and November 2005 (i.e., when the project was substantively constructed). Further, the review was divided into two geographic areas: property transactions within the wind plant area and property transactions within the rest of the Township. This review indicated that:

Date	Comments Received	Response
		– averaged asking price was similar in the wind plant area – averaged sale price was higher in the wind plant area – averaged difference between asking price and sale price was lower within the wind plant area (positive position) – majority of properties sold were small acreages (i.e., of the known acreages – two acreages were not known – 17 of 27 properties were 20 acres or less).
	– Cause an increase in **road traffic**	• During construction activities project components, supplies, materials, equipment, and personnel associated with the project will be moved on local and regional roads. As such, in comparison to existing/baseline traffic volumes, there will be increased traffic volumes. • During the Environmental Screening Process the potential effects of construction traffic will be further evaluated.
	– Cause an increase in **ferry traffic**	• A temporary increase in ferry/boat traffic volume is possible during the construction phase. CREC recognizes the importance of the MTO ferry services to the inhabitants of Wolfe Island and will work with the MTO in an effort to minimize the potential for effects on ferry and boat traffic volume. • CREC plans to develop a delivery schedule and management plan in consultation with the Ontario Ministry of Transportation, with the goal of minimizing disruption of local traffic patterns. • CREC is currently looking at the feasibility of using the Ministry of Transportation's winter ferry dock to reduce effects on ferry traffic levels at the main ferry throughout the spring to autumn months. • More detailed analysis will be conducted as part of the Environmental Screening Process.
	– **Light** up the night sky with aircraft warning lights	• The project must comply with the aviation safety lighting and marking standards specified by Transport Canada as set out in the Canadian Aviation Regulations and Standards. • Our current understanding of the draft standards is that wind turbines more than 900 m from a turbine with an aviation safety light will also require a light – lighting is anticipated to be a red flashing light at night (about 20 flashes/minute) with an intensity of approximately 2,000 candelas. Perimeter turbines in the wind plant area are also required to be painted white under the draft standards. • However, based upon the current draft standards, and past experience, it is not expected that all of the 86 wind turbines will require an aviation safety light on top of the tower.
	– Negatively effect the **migratory bird**	• Waterfowl and raptor surveys, coupled with a detailed review of previous field studies, have been

Date	Comments Received	Response
	routes	conducted as part of the Environmental Screening Process • Final results will be presented in the Environmental Screening Report; which will be available for stakeholder and agency review later this year following review and comment of this issue with Environment Canada and the Canadian Wildlife Service. • On average, the wind industry is finding an average mortality rate of one to two 1 - 2 birds per turbine per year – put another way, a domestic cat that roams outside is likely to kill many more birds in a year than a wind turbine. Additionally, human-made structures such as buildings and windows, communications towers, and cars collectively cause annual mortality rates in the millions.
	– Cause **noise**	• Like anything mechanical, wind turbines create noise – mechanical (for example the gear box in the nacelle) and aerodynamic (whooshing of blades). • The Project must comply with the environmental noise requirements of the Ministry of the Environment ("MOE") as outlined in their document entitled: Interpretation for Applying MOE NPC Technical Publications to Wind Turbine Generators (06 July 2004). • To demonstrate compliance, CREC will undertake detailed noise modelling and prepare and submit an Environmental Noise Impact Assessment report to the MOE for technical review and approval.
	– We are VERY concerned about the impact of the **electromagnetics** on our health	• Extensive research has been done to study potential human health effects related to Electric and Magnetic Fields ("EMF"). According to the National Research Council, Health Canada, and the Cancer Society, available laboratory and human data have not clearly demonstrated what, if any, magnitudes of power line EMF cause human health effects. What is known is the fact that EMF intensities decrease with distance from the source. • EMF exists in everyday life – in our homes and environment – so people are constantly exposed to varying levels of EMF on a daily basis. However, these fields tend to be much smaller than those produced naturally by your brain, nerves, and heart. Additional information on EMF is provided on Health Canada's website: www.hc-sc.gc.ca.
Mar 22 Open House	• a) To provide useful comments, we need data on turbulence and **wind velocities downstream** of these generators under a range of wind strengths	• Wind turbines by their nature create a downwind wake effect and this effect is built into the siting of the wind turbines. The extent and intensity of the wake effect is quite variable depending upon wind speeds, direction, turbine placement, existing landscape features, etc. • It is not expected that the turbines will affect sailing within the Lower Gap. However, CREC understands the importance of sailing regattas held in this reach and will review this issue further as

Date	Comments Received	Response
		the project continues to evolve.
	• b) We also need info on how it is decided whether the **generators are place** in line abreast or in squares and patterns • c) And then the effects on (a) of the choices made in (c)	• There are numerous factors that combine to influence the location of the wind turbines, some of which include: regional wind regime, local wind regime, lands under Option to CREC, location of environmental features, municipal setbacks (e.g., roads, property lines, houses, etc.), provincial setbacks (e.g., wetlands, watercourses, etc.), predicted environmental noise levels at non-participating residences, wake effects (i.e., the turbulence one turbine creates on an adjacent turbine), and landowner preferences. • Detailed siting activities will be carried out by CREC during the Environmental Screening Process, culminating with the preferred layout documented in the Environmental Screening Report.
Mar 22 Open House	• Hope to have a number of units on my property • Born and raised near windmills all my life • Great project for the island!	• Standard Letter
Mar 22 Open House	• If you're placing tower within 1000 ft from house • Should be OK by owner • If not tower should be further away	• Setbacks are determined based on a number of factors. • The Township of Frontenac and Islands will specify a minimum setback distance between turbines and participating houses (currently proposed by CREC as blade length plus five metres) and turbines and non-participating houses (currently proposed by CREC as 350 m) through the zoning process. • The Ministry of the Environment also requires the project demonstrate compliance with its environmental noise guidelines – which also affects the distance of wind turbines from houses. However, unlike zoning setbacks which tend to be a linear measured distance in metres, noise works on sound levels as measured in a-weighted decibles. • Landowners that will have a turbine located on their property will have opportunities to refine the siting of the wind facilities through discussion with CREC.
Mar 22 Open House	• Good open house at Sacred Heart school tonite. • Your reps did a good job answering questions • I look forward to seeing your updates to the website resulting from the open house, thanks.	• Standard Letter
Mar 22 Open	• No comment	• Standard Letter

Date	Comments Received	Response
House		
Mar 22 Open House	• No comment	• Standard Letter
Mar 22 Open House	• No comment	• Standard Letter
Mar 22 Open House	• No comment	• Standard Letter
Mar 22 Open House	• No comment	• Standard Letter
Mar 23 Open House	• What will the above ground power lines look like?	• The electrical collector lines on Wolfe Island will have a voltage of 34.5 kV. To the extent possible, these collector lines will be placed underground where technically feasible. In areas where underground lines are not feasible (e.g., due to shallow bedrock), aboveground lines will be installed on wooded poles. • The electrical transmission lines on the Kingston mainland will have a voltage of 230 kV and may be comprised of two, three phase circuits. These lines are strung on steel monopoles about 30 - 35 metres tall. For continued clarity monopoles are not steel lattice towers. The monopoles look similar to the wooden poles, but tend to be taller and stronger because of the engineered separation requirements between the phases and the design requirements associated with wind and ice loading (which have increased to reflect the lessons learned from the 1998 ice storm).
	• How insulated?	• Overhead power lines are not insulated in the traditional sense of wrapping them protective insulating coatings. Rather, the air provides the necessary insulation through physical separation. One of the reasons transmission poles have cross pieces, on which the power lines are mounted, is to ensure that the lines are kept apart from one another. Another reason why power lines are not insulated is to allow heat that naturally builds up in the lines to dissipate.
	• What is the **sound level** and range of turbines?	• Like anything mechanical, wind turbines create noise – mechanical (for example the gear box in the

Date	Comments Received	Response
		nacelle) and aerodynamic (whooshing of blades). • The Project must comply with the environmental noise requirements of the Ministry of the Environment ("MOE") as outlined in their document entitled: Interpretation for Applying MOE NPC Technical Publications to Wind Turbine Generators (06 July 2004). • To demonstrate compliance, CREC will undertake detailed noise modeling and prepare and submit an Environmental Noise Impact Assessment report to the MOE for technical review and approval.
Mar 23 Open House	• Peter Prier & Rob Nadolny: very helpful • Ross Keating: good listener	• Standard Letter
Mar 23 Open House	• My questions were adequately answered, although preliminary. Thanks.	• Could not respond, no name given
Mar 23 Open House	• Impressive project, wish you every success • Possible issue could be the downwind wake effects on the Kingston General Hospital smoke stack! • P.S. may be interested in investing/shares!	• On comment card, says that Moe spoke to Mr. Johnson, "it's all okay" • Standard Letter
Mar 23 Open House	• It's encouraging to see the positive support for this project. That's not always the case in this area.	• Standard Letter
Mar 23 Open House	• We strongly support this activity	• Standard Letter
Mar 23 Open House	• A valuable experience to learn some of the steps being taken to understand the environmental impact of wind-farming. • I have a better idea of how the Wolfe Island installation will look and how it will work.	• CREC concurs that renewable energy projects, like wind, are much needed in Ontario to help replace the province's aging electrical supplies and offset the planned closings of coal-fired generating stations. • The wind manufacturing industry within Canada is continuing to evolve as renewable energy projects begin to represent a greater percentage in the generation supply mix. In time it is possible that wind

Date	Comments Received	Response
	• I fully support wind-generation, whose time has come, I hope that Canada can develop a wind-generator industry which does not require imported machinery and equipment	turbine manufacturing companies will offer a complete "Made in Canada" solution.
Mar 23 Open House	• As an employee of Utilities Kingston, am interested to understand the construction of the 230kV transmission line and it's proximity to existing Hydro One 44kV feeders. • Would also like to understand what impact, if any, this generation will have on the available fault current at the Gardiner TS Bus. • As a resident of Kingston I am concerned about the appearance of the 230kV transmission line along Bath road and the waterfront.	• CREC will continue to work with Utilities Kingston, the IESO, and Hydro One Networks Inc. to address this comments to ensure that there is no significant effects on existing infrastructure and/or affected parties are in agreement with the required work activities.
Mar 23 Open House	• I'm so pleased to see this worthy project coming closer to reality after many years of effort by all parties concerned. • This is the future for energy production in Ontario, and none too soon! • This and other projects in our region (such as my home of Pr. Ed. County) will set an example for others to foolow and will demonstrate to the public, including the few naysayers, how clean, green energy is made.	• CREC concurs that renewable energy projects, like wind, are much needed in Ontario to help replace the province's aging electrical supplies and offset the planned closings of coal-fired generating stations – thank you for your interest in this renewable wind power project.
Mar 23 Open House	• Interested in working on transmission and distribution aspects of project	• Interest and contact info passed on to CREC
Mar 23 Open	• This will create a new tourist feature for the area • Aesthetically will be beautiful	• CREC concurs and has heard many stakeholders describe the wind turbines as majestic . • Experience in Alberta, and other parts of the world, indicates that the wind turbines will draw wind,

Date	Comments Received	Response
House	• Reverse process could provide wind for the harbour and the sailors!! (tongue in cheek)	environmental, educational, and other enthusiasts to the area.
Mar 23 Open House	• Would like to meet with Casey Rip, the Project Construction Manager whenever he may be available in the Kingston area. Thank you.	• Interest and contact info passed on to CREC
Mar 23 Open House	• Support the project 100% • Just worried about big, above ground transmission line running up my street (Sunny Acres) • Hope the new, alternative route through Invista will work – please keep me posted. Thanks.	• CREC heard during the 2004 Public Open Houses that area residents did not prefer the alternative route proposed for Sunny Acres Road. Partly as a result of this feedback, this alternative was not carried forward as the preliminary preferred route. • Additional work done during the Environmental Screening Process will refine the preliminary preferred route and will lead to the identification of the final preferred route. • The final preferred route will be environmentally sound, economically feasible, and technically preferred.
Mar 23 Open House	• As long as the proposed & ultimate transmission corridor stays on the EAST SIDE of Invista, I am generally supportive	• CREC heard during the 2004 Public Open Houses that area residents did not prefer the alternative route proposed for Sunny Acres Road. Partly as a result of this feedback, this alternative was not carried forward as the preliminary preferred route. • Additional work done during the Environmental Screening Process will refine the preliminary preferred route and will lead to the identification of the final preferred route. • The final preferred route will be environmentally sound, economically feasible, and technically preferred.
	• Efforts should be made to **bury cable** through the Invista property and on Front Rd. If it isn't buried now it never will be • Cutting across prison property on poles further north is fine. • Keep me informed. Good luck with the project	• Burying extended lengths of the 230kv line is cost prohibitive, typically costing 3 to 5 times the cost of overhead line.
Mar 23 Open House	• Very supportive. Excellent.	• Standard Letter

Date	Comments Received	Response
Mar 23 Open House	• Very informative for this stage of the project. • Good presentation, very informed, professional, easy to talk to.	• Standard Letter
Mar 23 Open House	• Two aspects concern us – Plan shows high transmission lines (aerial) adjacent to **Girl Guide Camp** – Carruther's Pt. Need to carry lines underground well beyond Guide Camp to maintain atmosphere of site.	• At the present time the transmission line is proposed as overhead in the area of the Girl Guide Camp. In this area the transmission line is proposed to be routed on the Invista lands and not on the Girl Guide property. However, CREC will review this comment during the detailed power line design works, prior to taking a final decision.
	– Destruction of shore **fringe woodlands** where underground transmission lines come ashore	• All reasonable measures will be used to avoid tree cutting to accommodate the power line in this area. • The Environmental Screening Process will describe the siting process and mitigation strategy used to minimize effects on the natural environment where the submarine transmission lines comes ashore on the Kingston mainland.
Mar 23 Open House	• Thank you for holding this open house • I have previously written (by email) re: the location of transmission poles in the Invista/Dupont/Sunny Acres area • If the current plan goes ahead – I'll be happy!	• CREC heard during the 2004 Public Open Houses that area residents did not prefer the alternative route proposed for Sunny Acres Road. Partly as a result of this feedback, this alternative was not carried forward as the preliminary preferred route. • Additional work done during the Environmental Screening Process will refine the preliminary preferred route and will lead to the identification of the final preferred route. • The final preferred route will be environmentally sound, economically feasible, and technically preferred.
Mar 23 Open House	• Would like more details about the land transmission route, in particular, using poles for such high volumes. • Good luck!	• The electrical transmission lines on the Kingston mainland will have a voltage of 230 kV and may be comprised of two, three phase circuits. These lines are strung on steel monopoles about 30 - 35 metres tall. For continued clarity monopoles are not steel lattice towers. The monopoles look similar to the wooden poles, but tend to be taller and stronger because of the engineered separation requirements between the phases and the design requirements associated with wind and ice loading (which have increased to reflect the lessons learned from the 1998 ice storm). • The overhead transmission line will be constructed in accordance with the applicable standards and regulations, such as those Electrical Standards Authority (ESA). The engineered transmission line design will be required to undergo technical review by the ESA prior to finalization of the design. The

Date	Comments Received	Response
		poles used for the transmission line are commonly used for the voltage (250 kV) that this line will be operating at. • Referred to website for preliminary preferred route for mainland transmission line
Mar 23 Open House	• I understand that underground transmission cables are very expensive but I still prefer that transmission companies and local utilities start burying their lines	• With regard for stakeholder comments, CREC is proposing to place all power lines underground where feasible on Wolfe Island. The final decision of whether or not the lines will be buried on the Island will depend upon several factors to be determined during the detailed design process. • A key factor will be depth to bedrock – buried cables generally require 1 - 1.5 metres of cover. Consequently, if there are areas with insufficient cover to maintain safety parameters, the power line will by necessity be overhead. • Burying extended lengths of the 230kv line is cost prohibitive, typically costing 3 to 5 times the cost of overhead line.
Mar 23 Open House	• No comment	• Standard Letter
Mar 23 Open House	• No comment	• Standard Letter
Mar 23 Open House	• No comment	• Standard Letter
Mar 23 Open House	• No comment	• Standard Letter
Mar 23 Open House	• No comment	• Standard Letter
Mar 23 Open	• No comment	• Standard Letter

Date	Comments Received	Response
House		
Mar 23 Open House	• No comment	• Standard Letter
Mar 23 Open House	• No comment	• Standard Letter
Mar 23 Open House	• No comment	• Standard Letter
Mar 22 Open House	• Concerns with interference with **shipping**: U.S. Coast Guard believes interference occurs within 10 nautical miles – provided copy of newspaper article	• The wind turbines are not expected to interfere with communications and navigation equipment. CREC has confirmed with iSERV, the provincial ministry responsible for maintaining cellular emergency communication networks, that they have no concern with the project.
	• **Setbacks from residential property** should be at least 5000 ft	• Setbacks are determined based on a number of factors. • The Township of Frontenac and Islands will specify a minimum setback distance between turbines and participating houses (currently proposed by CREC as blade length plus five metres) and turbines and non-participating houses (currently proposed by CREC as 350 m) through the zoning process. • The Ministry of the Environment also requires the project demonstrate compliance with its environmental noise guidelines – which also affects the distance of wind turbines from houses. However, unlike zoning setbacks which tend to be a linear measured distance in metres, noise works on sound levels as measured in a-weighted decibels.
	• **Wetlands** like Big Sandy Bay and Button Bay as well as the shoreline in general need to be preserved due to natural and aesthetic value (reflected in tax assessment and property values) – turbines should be as far away as possible (at least one mile)	• During the Environmental Screening Process setbacks around wetlands will be determined and siting undertaken to ensure wind turbines are not located within wetland boundaries – typical setbacks include 120 m from provincially significant wetlands and 50 m from non-provincially significant wetlands.
	• If turbines are placed on Wolfe Island, they should be located in geometrically homogenous corridors	• There are numerous factors that combine to influence the location of the wind turbines, some of which include: regional wind regime, local wind regime, lands under Option to CREC, location of

Date	Comments Received	Response
	framed by existing roadways, not **placed** in a irregular fashion.	environmental features, municipal setbacks (e.g., roads, property lines, houses, etc.), provincial setbacks (e.g., wetlands, watercourses, etc.), predicted environmental noise levels at non-participating residences, wake effects (i.e., the turbulence one turbine creates on an adjacent turbine), and landowner preferences. • Detailed siting activities will be carried out by CREC during the Environmental Screening Process, culminating with the preferred layout documented in the Environmental Screening Report.
	• All transmission lines should be **underground** or should follow existing Hydro poles i.e. no new transmission poles above ground.	• With regard for stakeholder comments, CREC is proposing to place all power lines underground where feasible on Wolfe Island. The final decision of whether or not the lines will be buried on the Island will depend upon several factors to be determined during the detailed design process. • A key factor will be depth to bedrock – buried cables generally require 1 - 1.5 metres of cover. Consequently, if there are areas with insufficient cover to maintain safety parameters, the power line will by necessity be overhead.
	• Some **benefit to residents** is possible through additional tax revenues, but residents without turbine leases have no direct benefits. Residents in project area who do not have leases should be "compensated" for the loss of quality of life by significant long-term reductions in hydro bills. • If wind farm project is designed to produce relatively clean cost-effective power, let's give some back to the people of Wolfe Island, not just ship the finished product to the mainland.	• The price consumers pay for electricity is set by the Government of Ontario based on many different cost factors such generation, transmission, distribution, debt retirement, and electrical losses, among others. • The Wolfe Island Wind Project will generate a clean, renewable supply of electricity at a competitive price over its 20-year Renewable Energy Supply Contract period and beyond. During the 20-year period the price of electricity sold from the project is essentially fixed, so the project will assist the Government in establishing long-term stable prices for electricity. • The project is required to complete federal, provincial, and local environmental and planning processes. These processes are intended to account for potential environmental and socio-economic effects that may affect quality of life. Accordingly, CREC does not intend to directly provide financial compensation to landowners without a wind turbine.
Mar 23 Open House	• My concerns are the design and location of the transmission lines on the Kingston mainland.	• The electrical transmission lines on the Kingston mainland will have a voltage of 230 kV and may be comprised of two, three phase circuits. These lines are strung on steel monopoles about 30 - 35 metres tall. For continued clarity monopoles are not steel lattice towers. The monopoles look similar to the wooden poles, but tend to be taller and stronger because of the engineered separation requirements between the phases and the design requirements associated with wind and ice loading (which have increased to reflect the lessons learned from the 1998 ice storm).

Date	Comments Received	Response
		• Preliminary preferred route presented as a display board, available on project website • Additional work done during the Environmental Screening Process will refine the preliminary preferred route and will lead to the identification of the final preferred route. • The final preferred route will be environmentally sound, economically feasible, and technically preferred.
	• Also the lighting of the wind mills at night.	• The project must comply with the aviation safety lighting and marking standards specified by Transport Canada as set out in the Canadian Aviation Regulations and Standards. • Our current understanding of the draft standards is that wind turbines more than 900 m from a turbine with an aviation safety light will also require a light – lighting is anticipated to be a red flashing light at night (about 20 flashes/minute) with an intensity of approximately 2,000 candelas. Perimeter turbines in the wind plant area are also required to be painted white under the draft standards . • However, based upon the current draft standards, and past experience, it is not expected that all of the 86 wind turbines will require an aviation safety light on top of the tower.
Mar 2006 Open House	• I'm concerned with proximity to water and swamp land	• During the Environmental Screening Process setbacks around wetlands will be determined and siting undertaken to ensure wind turbines are not located within wetland boundaries – typical setbacks include 120 m from provincially significant wetlands and 50 m from non-provincially significant wetlands. CREC typically uses a a setback distance of 50 metres from wind turbines to permanent water courses.
	• Property values	• Property evaluation studies carried out in the U.S., Australia, and Europe, where wind turbines are more common, generally indicate that the installation of such facilities has no material adverse effect to property values. • Since there are no known Canadian studies on property value, Canadian Hydro Developers, Inc., the parent company of CREC, retained an independent Appraiser to review property transactions in Melancthon Township (Dufferin County), where they recently constructed a wind plant. The review was carried out for the period of time defined as November 2004 (i.e., when Canadian Hydro was awarded a RES Contract for the facility) and November 2005 (i.e., when the project was substantively constructed). Further, the review was divided into two geographic areas: property transactions within the wind plant area and property transactions within the rest of the Township. This review indicated that:

Date	Comments Received	Response
		– averaged asking price was similar in the wind plant area – averaged sale price was higher in the wind plant area – averaged difference between asking price and sale price was lower within the wind plant area (positive position) – majority of properties sold were small acreages (i.e., of the known acreages – two acreages were not known – 17 of 27 properties were 20 acres or less).
	• Benefits to community • Relationship with community • Taxes • Jobs	• Local benefits to the community from the Project will include, among others: – the creation of jobs during the construction phase – monies will be spent locally during construction on goods, services, and labour to the extent practicable – the creation of full and part-time employment during the operation phase – various monies associated with operation and maintenance activities will be spent locally to the extent practicable – the project will contribute a new source of taxation for the Township, County and Education systems with minimal demands for government services - this will assist in increasing the municipal budget and reducing the municipality's reliance on resident's tax dollars (i.e., providing additional diversification in the tax base) – royalty payments will be made to participating landowners who are likely to spend part of the new income locally
	• Migrating birds	• Waterfowl and raptor surveys, coupled with a detailed review of previous field studies, have been conducted as part of the Environmental Screening Process. Final results will be presented in the Environmental Screening Report; which will be available for stakeholder and agency review later this year following review and comment of this issue with Environment Canada and the Canadian Wildlife Service. • On average, the wind industry is finding an average mortality rate of one to two birds per turbine per year – put another way, a domestic cat that roams outside is likely to kill more birds in a year than a wind turbine. Additionally, human-made structures such as buildings and windows, communications towers, and cars collectively cause annual mortality rates in the millions.

Date	Comments Received	Response
	• Noise	• Like anything mechanical, wind turbines create noise – mechanical (for example the gear box in the nacelle) and aerodynamic (whooshing of blades). However, you can stand beneath the wind turbine and have a normal conversation without raising your voice. • The Project must comply with the environmental noise requirements of the Ministry of the Environment ("MOE") as outlined in their document entitled: Interpretation for Applying MOE NPC Technical Publications to Wind Turbine Generators (06 July 2004). To demonstrate compliance, CREC will undertake detailed noise modeling and prepare and submit an Environmental Noise Impact Assessment report to the MOE for technical review and approval.
	• Traffic	• During construction activities project components, supplies, materials, equipment, and personnel associated with the project will be moved on local and regional roads. As such, in comparison to existing/baseline traffic volumes, there will be increased traffic volumes. During the Environmental Screening Process the potential effects of construction traffic will be further evaluated. • With respect to ferry traffic, a temporary increase in ferry/boat traffic volume is possible during the construction phase. CREC recognizes the importance of the Ontario Ministry of Transportation ("MTO") ferry services to the inhabitants of Wolfe Island and will work with the MTO in an effort to minimize the potential for effects on ferry and boat traffic volume. CREC plans to develop a delivery schedule and management plan in consultation with the MTO, with the goal of minimizing disruption of local traffic patterns. CREC is currently looking at the feasibility of using the MTO's winter ferry dock to reduce effects on ferry traffic levels at the main ferry throughout the spring to autumn months. More detailed analysis will be conducted as part of the Environmental Screening Process.
	• Roads • Etc…	• Several aspects of the road system on Wolfe Island will be considered during the Environmental Screening Process, including potential effects on existing roads from increased construction traffic, and the locations of access roads for the wind turbines.
Mar 22 Open House	• my son in law represents St. Lawrence Cement • included contact information for son in law	• Son-in-law's contact information passed on to CREC
Mar 22 and 23 Open House	• Wolfe Island is not huge. The space is, obviously, confined compared to the mainland. • As part of the 1000 Islands, it is important that it	• Standard Letter

Date	Comments Received	Response
	remain beautiful. • The quantity of turbines, 86, seems huge under these conditions. I realize that there is economy in numbers, but the increase from the original 13 (?) to 86 is hard to take. If this quantity is essential – please – no more! • To have a turbine always hovering nearby will put considerable stress on the community.	
Mar 22 and 23 Open House Postmark Mar 30	• Are there setbacks, i.e. distances from (a) houses	• Township of Frontenac Islands ultimately decides minimum setback distances through zoning process • The distance between wind turbines and participating houses currently proposed by CREC as blade length plus five metres (i.e., 50 metres) • The distance between wind turbines and non-participating houses – currently proposed by CREC as 350 m • The distance between lot line(s) of two adjoining participating landowners – currently proposed by CREC as 0 metres • The distance between wind turbines and the lot line of a non-participating landowner or the municipal road allowance – currently proposed by CREC as blade length plus five metres.
	• , (b) barns with livestock, (c) shoreline within which wind turbines may not be erected? If so, what are the distances?	• While no specific setback has been proposed by CREC for a livestock barn, the minimum setback generally used by the company is blade length plus five metres (i.e., 50 metres). Also, CREC typically uses a setback distance of 50 metres from wind turbines to permanent water courses
	• Where or what are the statutes/regulations/by-laws which state this? I would like to be able to read them.	• The Ministry of the Environment ("MOE") also requires the project demonstrate compliance with its environmental noise guidelines – which also affects the distance of wind turbines from houses. However, unlike zoning setbacks which tend to be a linear measured distance in metres, noise works on sound levels as measured in a-weighted decibels. The MOE's environmental noise guideline for wind turbines is available at: http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/envision/gp/4709e.pdf. • Other provincial setbacks include those covered under the Provincial Policy Statement ("PPS"), which defines setbacks from environmental features such as Provincially Significant Wetlands. You can find the PPS online at: http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/userfiles/HTML/nts_1_23137_1.html.
Mar 22	• I wish we could find the source of water course	• In response to the comments you submitted to project representatives, the Ministry of Natural

Date	Comments Received	Response
Open House	information you used. In your maps you show several water courses going through out property, we can identify only two, or three at the most, including seasonal ones. • This could seriously affect our ability to have turbines located in our property.	Resources ("MNR") is the source of the watercourse mapping we used at the Public Open House. This mapping is from MNR's Natural Resources & Values Information System ("NRVIS") database. All natural environment mapping presented at the Public Open House consisted of the preliminary, coarse data collected to date. If an error or misrepresentation has been made on any of the existing mapping, it will be refined through in-field investigations and consultation with the participating landowner. • CREC typically uses a setback distance of 50 metres from wind turbines to permanent water courses. Of course, setbacks from watercourses, as with other environmental features and municipal requirements, does reduce the area available for siting wind turbines.
Mar 22 Open House	• no comment	• Standard Letter
Mar 22 Open House	• No comment	• Standard Letter
Mar 22 Open House	• We appreciate to be kept informed. The landowners and public meeting was very informative	• Standard Letter
Mar 22 Open House	• Some optioned properties appear much too close to wetlands	• During the Environmental Screening Process setbacks around wetlands will be determined and siting undertaken to ensure wind turbines are not located within wetland boundaries – typical setbacks include 120 m from provincially significant wetlands and 50 m from non-provincially significant wetlands.
	• How much monitoring for bird and bat kills will be done after construction • Will there be a process to shut down turbines if bird or bat deaths exceed a certain number?	• All monitoring programs, including a program for birds and bats, are considered and developed as part of the Environmental Screening Process, and will be presented in the Environmental Screening Report, which will be released for stakeholder review later this year.
March 2006 Open House	• My concerns are the proximity of Windmill to protected species/swamp areas/ • bird migratory patterns being affected/	• Setbacks are determined based on a number of factors. • The Township of Frontenac and Islands will specify a minimum setback distance between turbines and participating houses (currently proposed by CREC as blade length plus five metres) and turbines and non-participating houses (currently proposed by CREC as 350 m) through the zoning process.

Date	Comments Received	Response
	• closeness to actual residence/	• The Ministry of the Environment also requires the project demonstrate compliance with its environmental noise guidelines – which also affects the distance of wind turbines from houses. However, unlike zoning setbacks which tend to be a linear measured distance in metres, noise works on sound levels as measured in a-weighted decibels. • During the Environmental Screening Process setbacks around wetlands will be determined and siting undertaken to ensure wind turbines are not located within wetland boundaries – typical setbacks include 120 m from provincially significant wetlands and 50 m from non-provincially significant wetlands.
	• property value depreciation/	• Property evaluation studies carried out in the U.S., Australia, and Europe, where wind turbines are more common, generally indicate that the installation of such facilities has no material adverse effect to property values. • Since there are no known Canadian studies on property value, Canadian Hydro Developers, Inc., the parent company of CREC, retained an independent Appraiser to review property transactions in Melancthon Township (Dufferin County), where they recently constructed a wind plant. The review was carried out for the period of time defined as November 2004 (i.e., when Canadian Hydro was awarded a RES Contract for the facility) and November 2005 (i.e., when the project was substantively constructed). Further, the review was divided into two geographic areas: property transactions within the wind plant area and property transactions within the rest of the Township. This review indicated that: – averaged asking price was similar in the wind plant area – averaged sale price was higher in the wind plant area – averaged difference between asking price and sale price was lower within the wind plant area (positive position) – majority of properties sold were small acreages (i.e., of the known acreages – two acreages were not known – 17 of 27 properties were 20 acres or less).
	• noise etc.	• Like anything mechanical, wind turbines create noise – mechanical (for example the gear box in the nacelle) and aerodynamic (whooshing of blades). • The Project must comply with the environmental noise requirements of the Ministry of the Environment ("MOE") as outlined in their document entitled: Interpretation for Applying MOE NPC Technical

Date	Comments Received	Response
		Publications to Wind Turbine Generators (06 July 2004). • To demonstrate compliance, CREC will undertake detailed noise modelling and prepare and submit an Environmental Noise Impact Assessment report to the MOE for technical review and approval.
March 2006 Open House	• I am concerned about property values.	• Property evaluation studies carried out in the U.S., Australia, and Europe, where wind turbines are more common, generally indicate that the installation of such facilities has no material adverse effect to property values. • Since there are no known Canadian studies on property value, Canadian Hydro Developers, Inc., the parent company of CREC, retained an independent Appraiser to review property transactions in Melancthon Township (Dufferin County), where they recently constructed a wind plant. The review was carried out for the period of time defined as November 2004 (i.e., when Canadian Hydro was awarded a RES Contract for the facility) and November 2005 (i.e., when the project was substantively constructed). Further, the review was divided into two geographic areas: property transactions within the wind plant area and property transactions within the rest of the Township. This review indicated that: – averaged asking price was similar in the wind plant area – averaged sale price was higher in the wind plant area – averaged difference between asking price and sale price was lower within the wind plant area (positive position) – majority of properties sold were small acreages (i.e., of the known acreages – two acreages were not known – 17 of 27 properties were 20 acres or less).
	• Concerned about what, exactly will be the benefit to Wolfe Island, not just to the residents who lease their land for this project.	• Local benefits to the community from the Project will include, among others: • the creation of jobs during the construction phase • monies will be spent locally during construction on goods, services, and labour to the extent practicable • the creation of full and part-time employment during the operation phase • various monies associated with operation and maintenance activities will be spent locally to the extent practicable • the project will contribute a new source of taxation for the Township, County and Education systems

Date	Comments Received	Response
		with minimal demands for government services - this will assist in increasing the municipal budget and reducing the municipality's reliance on resident's tax dollars (i.e. providing additional diversification in the tax base) • royalty payments will be made to participating landowners who are likely to spend part of the new income locally
March 23, 2006 Open House	• No comments	• Standard Letter
March 2006 Open House	• Waterfront landowners • What is the setback from old highway 96 west to the first towers? • What is the noise level at that setback? • How and where will the power be conveyed to the transfer station in our area? • Will it be underground or overhead? • How will these towers be lit? • Where will the service roads be located from the highway or form the base line rd.? • When will the bulk of construction take place in our area, Summer or Winter? • With the amount of land that is now assembled, how many more than 86 towers can we expect in the next few years? • This whole change in the character of our community has us very concerned for our property value!	• Thank you for attending the open houses. • With regard to setback distances: the township of Frontenac Islands will ultimately specify minimum setback distances between turbines and houses; and turbines and lot lines. • With regard to Property Value: Property evaluation studies carried out in the U.S., Australia, and Europe, where wind turbines are more common, generally indicate that the installation of such facilities has no material adverse effect to property values. • Since there are no known Canadian studies on property value, Canadian Hydro Developers, Inc., the parent company of CREC, retained an independent Appraiser to review property transactions in Melancthon Township (Dufferin County), where they recently constructed a wind plant. The review was carried out for the period of time defined as November 2004 (i.e., when Canadian Hydro was awarded a RES Contract for the facility) and November 2005 (i.e., when the project was substantively constructed). Further, the review was divided into two geographic areas: property transactions within the wind plant area and property transactions within the rest of the Township. This review indicated that: –averaged asking price was similar in the wind plant area –averaged sale price was higher in the wind plant area –averaged difference between asking price and sale price was lower within the wind plant area (positive position) • Like anything mechanical, wind turbines create noise, however, you can stand beneath the wind turbine and have a normal conversation without raising your voice. • The project must comply with MOE's noise guidelines.

Date	Comments Received	Response
		• There will be collector line connecting the turbines to a transformer station located on Wolfe Island. The lines are likely to be both overhead and underground. The placement of lines underground depends on a number of things, including depth to bedrock. • The project must comply with the aviation safety lighting and marking standards specified by Transport Canada as set out in the *Canadian Aviation Regulations.* Lighting is anticipated to be a red flashing light at night. It is not expected that all86 of the turbines will require an aviation safety light on top of the tower.
		• The location of service roads has not yet been determined, but will be presented at the next public open house, anticipated later this summer. • Construction is anticipated to commence in winter 2007and be completed by September 2008. Consequently, both summer and winter months will receive construction activities.
March 2006 Open House	• No comments	• Standard letter
March 2006 Open House	• You are all doing a tremendous job in a difficult role. • As owners, we feel you are doing an excellent job being open and honest with excellent communication and P.R. • We also have done our “homework” and visited Shelbourne two weeks ago. The received us like VIP’s. • Looking forward to hearing about individual placements by the end of the month.	

1.1.4 Comment Cards January 2007 Community Meeting

Date	Comments Received	Response Date	Response
Jan 30, 2007	• Thank you for underground approach • Accepting of proposed route east of Kingston Water Treatment Plant when cable comes out of water which is east of fence between water plant and Invista • Preferred Route as given Jan 30/07 meeting • 3 stay east of (illegible) • 4 coming in at Sand Bay, would even be better		
Jan 30, 2007	• add him to stakeholder list		
Jan 30, 2007	• project's benefits to society and environment outweigh any other known means of power generation • together with conservation, windfarms such as this must be expatiated ASAP without further delay • wind resource here is outstanding, and the need for clean source of energy in this province is great, if we ever hope to replace coal		

1.1.5 Comment Cards March 2007 Public Open House

Date	Comments Received	Response
March 28, 2007	• Is the noise level 40dB at all time or will it be cumulative, i.e., 10 turbines x 40dB = 400dB?	• Thank you for attending POH • All display panels are available on Project's website • In response to your question about environmental noise levels, the 40 dBA Ministry of the Environment ("MOE") noise guideline represents the total sound level at a receptor. A "receptor" is the terminology used by the MOE to represent a permanent home or dwelling (i.e., non-participating residence). The 40 dBA level represents the collective sound level and does not represent the sound produced individually by each turbine. Thus, ten wind turbines may produce a combined noise level of 40 dBA at a receptor point, not 400 dBA (i.e., 10 turbines x 40 dBA = 400 dBA). Furthermore, Wolfe Island has been classified as Class 3 (Rural) as defined by the MOE's NPC-232 Publication (http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/envision/gp/3405e.pdf). As a result, the 40 dBA limit cannot be exceeded between the hours of 1900 to 0700, while the limit increases to 45 dBA between the hours of 0700 and 1900.
March 28, 2007	• please provide information about the history of property value changes near wind farm sites in Ontario • provide copy of Ontario Study on property value	• Thank you for attending POH • All display panels are available on Project's website • provided summaries of Ontario studies (Melanthon, and Melanthon and East Luther Grand Valley Townships) • Attached: Property Value Study – The Relationship of Windmill Development and Market Prices. 2006. Blake, Matlock, and Marshal Ltd. Prepared for Windrush Energy.

Date	Comments Received	Response
March 28, 2007	• The underwater cable has a maximum capability. • What is the maximum capability of the 230kV underwater cable? I am sure you are confident that it can handle 86 turbines • How many more turbines can it handle before it reaches maximum capability	• Thank you for attending POH • All display panels are available on Project's website • In response to your question about the capacity of the 230 kV submarine cable, the cable is rated for continuous operation at 200 MW, which is approximately equivalent to 86 (2.3 MW) turbines (i.e., 86 x 2.3 MW = 197.8 MW). Therefore, the 86 proposed turbines for the Project will essentially use all capacity available in the cable. Canadian Renewable Energy Corporation is not considering the possibility of adding future phases to the Wolfe Island Wind Project.
March 28, 2007	• Enjoyed visual presentation of wind project • Would have been helpful to have short presentation on status of project and brief Q&A session	• In response to your comment about a formal question and answer period at the Public Open House, we acknowledge that this has the benefit of everyone hearing the same answers from the project representatives. However, there isn't enough time in one evening for everyone's questions to be heard. This is why we use the open house forum with many project representatives present and answering questions, which means much more information is distributed to all stakeholders and more questions can be answered concurrently over the course of the evening.

Date	Comments Received	Response
March 28, 2007	• This project will be a great benefit to WI • Appears from these maps that turbine locations are around our property – we were not sufficiently informed of all aspects of the project • Primarily our fault as we did not actively seek the appropriate information • It would appear that all turbines have been set and no further leases are required	• Standard thank you letter
March 28, 2007	• It will be the greatest thing that has ever happened to WI	• Standard thank you letter
March 28, 2007	• Scope of impact studies is huge and attention to detail is impressive • Kingstonians should feel assured that any negative impact, if any, would be revealed by respective studies and addressed properly since CHD must comply with stringent regulations • I was also amazed with the number of regulatory boards and agencies involved in this project • I hope this will be a success • Looking forward to a greener Ontario	• Standard thank you letter

Date	Comments Received	Response
March 28, 2007	• Feel that wind generation is the gentlest form of power generation available at this time • However, we realize that a project of this size will have an impact on the island in regards to visibility • Ontario does need the power	• Standard thank you letter
March 28, 2007	• Excellent project • Good planning • Hope to see it in operation soon	• Standard thank you letter
March 28, 2007	• It is about time to do this project • Appreciate all the studies that have been and are being undertaken to ensure the quality of the end product • I am tired of hearing people's concerns; however, there is so much noise and pollution in this town today that no one seems to be in the slightest concern about • But they will worry about the windmills! • Very much appreciated your very honest boards showing visual impact • Beauty is in the eye of the beholder • There are many building in the town that I would call ugly and an eye-sore • Wind mills are not among them • Good luck on the project • Looking forward to be able to use wind energy	• Standard thank you letter
March 28, 2007	• Please sign me up to be on the WI wind project distribution list	• Standard thank you letter
March 28, 2007	• A terrific project • Eager to see it up and running	• Standard thank you letter

Date	Comments Received	Response
March 28, 2007	• No comment	• Standard thank you letter
March 27, 2007	• As a resident living along the road network that will accommodate most of the construction vehicles, I am very concerned about the dust and speed of traffic in my neighbourhood • Feel the serenity of the rural landscape will be drastically upset during the construction process • Assurances that reasonable and responsible speeds will be maintained (by contractors and sub-contractors alike) and enforced would be greatly appreciated	• Thank you for attending POH • All display boards now available on Project's website • The potential safety and nuisance effects of construction traffic is being assessed as part of the Environmental Review Report for the Project. If required, as determined during the detailed design phase of the Project, a traffic management program will be developed to deal with specific traffic planning issues. The program may consider the use of signage, road closures, speed restrictions, truck lighting, load restrictions, and equipment inspections. The traffic management program may also assure that all contractor employees adhere to local speed limits, traffic signage, and utilize safe defensive driving practices.
March 27, 2007	• think this is a great and beneficial project for WI • can't wait for construction to begin	• Standard thank you letter
March 27, 2007	• what reassurance do we have that our well water quality/quantity will remain intact • part of reason for moving and building here was because it was so quiet • Ministry guidelines state that noise levels must be below 40db outside the house • Other studies state that for sleeping, noise must be below 30db • Do this mean that we must sleep with our windows closed?	• thank you for taking the time to attend the POH, and for providing comments via the comment cards, and the project website • provided information on: water wells, noise, tourism, birds
	• requests 2 copies of layout map	• Standard thank you letter • Attached 2 copies of project layout map
Post marked March 31, 2007	• Who do I sue for property value loss and noise related illness	• Thank you for attending POH • All display panels are available on Project's website

Date	Comments Received	Response
		• Provided information on property value study as well as noise assessment
	• 30 wind mills on tiny WI is extreme • the money changers are still in the temple • profit before people even thought it is our taxes that will go to this project, our say is minor if at all	• thank you for attending POH • all display boards now available on Project's website • In response to the comments you submitted via comment, the following information is provided; however first, I would like to clarify one item: • CREC is proposing to construct a total of 86 wind turbines on Wolfe Island, placed through agreements with local landowners. The Project Description is available for viewing on the Project's website (http://www.wolfeislandwind.com/project_docs.htm) • Provided information on Government initiatives to honour international environmental commitments • Explained that no economic costs including taxes associated with the construction and operation of the Project will be passed onto Ontario taxpayers • Provided information on economic benefit to Kingston, and Township
March 28 2007	• Planning to build permanent home on WI in 2009. There are 7 turbines in our area, I'm concerned about he noise of 7 combined turbines near us, and also the light affixed the outside turbine • There are a lot of bats in that area, and the light will attract them as well as flashing annoyance so close to our home	• Thank you for comments on POH • Sent information regarding obtaining documents and project status, noise, turbine lighting, vibrations, generators, water wells, ferry impact, property value, increased number of turbines

Date	Comments Received	Response
	• Please list me as a stakeholder • Please send me ASAP the Environmental Screening Report and other documents from E. Screening Process • I need site specific information and the results of published reports on the following: • Disturbance, avoidance and mortality effects on bats, birds (raptors, waterfowl, shorebirds, migratory songbirds/passerines) • Noise levels from machines at specified distances; flicker effects of turbine blades • I consider this industrial facility to be too large, too intrusive, and perhaps too damaging to wildlife	• The ERR will be available summer of 2007 • Sent information on Noise, Shadow flicker, birds and bats
March 27, 2007	• Please explain to me how and when the ferry will be used to transport equipment and people and whether this will be a condition of any approvals or permits • Please explain whether there will be any above ground transmission lines and how this will be a condition of any permits and approvals	Thank you for your comments resulting from the POHs for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, held on March 27 and 28, 2007 Due to high level of community interest CREC has made the harmonized EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA - beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP Provided locations where EA is available for viewing The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence: Ferry Traffic, Permits and Approvals, Transmission Lines, Decommissioning Future Phases of Project – there is no proposed or planned second phase of the Wolfe Island Wind Project. As the Wolfe Island Wind Project proceeds, we will notify you of future activities. In the meantime, if you have any questions or comments with regards to the DRAFT EA or the Project in general, feel free to contact us directly

Date	Comments Received	Response
		Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007.
March 27, 2007	• Send Email once ERR is completed • Send the link to the Canadian Hydro website where the ERR will be posted	
March 27 2007	• Power from wind is more costly than from other sources, what are true economic costs to consumers • Research indicates there will be significant environmental impacts • Turbines increase wind speed, temperature and evaporation at ground level, what are implications for local ecology?	• Also a letter • Sent information on Project Economics, Ecology and Biodiversity, Birds, Property Value, Tourism, Noise, Health Effects, Ministerial Assessment and Evaluation Process, Setbacks
March 27, 2007	• Very concerned about: • Health impacts • Land property value decrease • Secondary health issues: dust, trucks driving down road to do maintenance • Impact to quality of life • Policing, what additional will you supply with 100+ men added to our community • Disgusted by a process which splits a community – will seek legal counsel if these windmills negatively impact my family or I	• Thank you for taking the time to attend the POH for the Wolfe Island Wind Project • Provided information on: potential health effects, property value, secondary health effects, community character, policing
March 27, 2007	• Maps have been kept secret • Project is not about local need • Should have used a pilot project • Why wasn't the mayor present?	• Provided information on: attendees (POH was advertised in local media, personal notifications sent to residences within study area and other stakeholders who had previously registered their attendance), mapping, local economic benefits.
March 28, 2007	• No comment	• Standard thank you letter

Date	Comments Received	Response
	• No comment	• Standard thank you letter
	• Attends Marysville Public School • Concerned with noise affecting ability to concentrate in school	• Thank you for your comments on the WI wind project • All information presented at the POH available on Project website • Draft EA is available for viewing on the project website, and in hard copy in the following locations • As a result of earlier consultation activities conducted for this project, the DRAFT EA addresses a wide range of topics. The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence: • Environmental Noise – Main Report, Section 7.7 and Technical Appendix C4
	• Visual impact is too great • Would rather see project with 8 turbines	• Provided information on: visual change, project siting and capacity
	• Concerned with impacts to birds/bats • Concerned with noise • Also sent webmail	• Sent information on noise, shadow flicker, birds/bats • Informed him of when ERR would be available
22 May 2007	• Value of properties in view of turbines before and after? • Impact on ferry traffic and what's being done to curb the already burdened summer traffic? • Where's the environmental impact assessment? (3 years coming)	• Due to the high level of community interest in this renewable energy initiative, Canadian Renewable Energy Corporation ("CREC") has made the harmonized Environmental Review Report / Environmental Impact Statement ("EA") available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment. This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA, beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP. • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence: Property Values, Ferry Traffic
	• Would like to be added to mailing list	• stakeholder added to project mailing list

Date	Comments Received	Response
	• Would like 2 copies of the project layout	• Stakeholder sent two copies of project layout
May 31, 2007	• Would like to be added to mailing list	• Stakeholder added to project mailing list

2.0 Release of Draft EA to Notice of Completion

2.1 GENERAL PROJECT COMMENTS

2.1.1 Webmail Comments

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
May 4, 2007	• To date we have received no responses from CHD • We expect an immediate response to these concerns as well as all other concerns submitted to CHD to date		No response required
May 8 2007	• What do each of the revenue sources mean? • Who gets what and for how long? • I understand that Howe Island gets 40% of the amenities agreement, is that correct?	June 6 2007	• Thank you for your comments resulting from the POHs for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, held on March 27 and 28, 2007 Provided link to Project's website and direct link to POH panels • Due to high level of community interest CREC has made the harmonized EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA - beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP • Provided locations where EA is available for viewing • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence: Economic Benefits • As the Wolfe Island Wind Project proceeds, we will notify you of future activities. • In the meantime, if you have any questions or comments with regards to the DRAFT EA or the Project in general, feel free to contact us directly

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
			• Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007.
May 8 2007	• Please confirm that this species of bat is being considered or is not an issue on the island – are there cross border investigations/impact studies being done? • Attached: article on brown bats flying into wind turbines	June 7, 2007	• Thank you for your comments resulting from the POHs for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, held on March 27 and 28, 2007 Provided link to Project's website and direct link to POH panels • Due to high level of community interest CREC has made the harmonized EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA - beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP • Provided locations where EA is available for viewing • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence: Bats, Cumulative Effects • In addition to the above noted information within the DRAFT EA, the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) is not known to occur in Canada and thus is not considered an issue on Wolfe Island. • As the Wolfe Island Wind Project proceeds, we will notify you of future activities. • In the meantime, if you have any questions or comments with regards to the DRAFT EA or the Project in general, feel free to contact us directly • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007.
May 9, 2007	• Copied Stantec on a WIRE petition to rescind the zoning by-law		No response required

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
May 11, 2007	• Recently a petition was circulated to some Wolfe Islanders asking that our Council rescind a zoning by-law permitting wind turbines to be built on certain areas of WI • Would like to pass on some comments about the petition and the group calling themselves "Wolfe Island Residents for the Environment" or WIRE • This is an anonymous group, we do not know who these individuals are, who they represent, or the bias they have towards this project • This is one more example of the idealism of some who call themselves environmentalists • How can a group that is "for the environment" be opposed to wind power? • Our view of a better environment includes wind power, preservation or wildlife habitat and other issues. This will only be achieved with solutions that have a broad and balanced perspective and recognize the need to compromise. • WIRE is concerned that the zoning by-law was passed quickly and without adequate consideration • This process has been going on for a few years now with a number of well attended public meetings, very easy access to the staff at CHD as well as our own Council. In fact, this council was recently elected after a campaign where wind power was a high profile topic • We believe the process WIRE is following is improper • Any group that disagrees with Council should go to Council first to try and influence them • We attend3ed the Council meeting where this by-law was discussed and it was very apparent this topic had been the subject of considerable debate. Furthermore, the passing of the by-law is just one step in the final approval for this		No response required

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	particular project • An environmental screening report is another element necessary for approval for this project but is not necessary prior to Council making a decision about a general zoning by-law applicable to any wind power project		
May 14 2007	• Thank you for window of opportunity you provided • Updated profile as CHD still considers my qualifications	June 21 2007	• Your information has been passed onto CHD for future consideration
May 19 2007	• Writing to express concerns about proposed windmills on WI • Let me first say that I support alternative energy • But there has been no satisfactory information presented to us about the environmental impact of so much construction • Realize that these huge towers will be here forever, without regard to the destruction that might be caused ecologically, and without any guarantees relative to the quality, solvency or ethics of the management companies which are in a constant state of change already • Certainly you might consider a project such as this out in the middle of Lake Ontario where the 'public domain' of a vast body of water would not be likely to affect the people and wildlife of Canada adversely	June 4, 2007	• Thank you for your comments resulting from the POHs for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, held on March 27 and 28, 2007 Provided link to Project's website and direct link to POH panels • Due to high level of community interest CREC has made the harmonized EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA - beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP • Provided locations where EA is available for viewing • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence: Project Consultation • In the meantime, if you have any questions or comments with regards to the DRAFT EA or the Project in general, feel free to contact us directly • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007.
22 May 2007	• just returned from a trip and saw the petition that has been sent to residents • glad someone is trying to find out a little more about the	June 4, 2007	• Thank you for your comments resulting from the POHs for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, held on March 27 and 28, 2007 Provided link to Project's website and direct link to

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	wind farm project because this is the first wind farm with towers of this size • also, the fact that many other concerns have been raised by individuals which have not been answered. There are too many 'unknowns' • I would like you to add my concerns to other you have received and I hope that more research will be carried out before this is a 'done deal'		POH panels • Due to high level of community interest CREC has made the harmonized EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA - beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP • Provided locations where EA is available for viewing • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence: Viewscape • In the meantime, if you have any questions or comments with regards to the DRAFT EA or the Project in general, feel free to contact us directly • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007.
25 May 2007	• Thank you very much for your follow up • In case I didn't make myself clear, I wholeheartedly support this project and look forward to the next stages • We'll be particularly interested to sit on our deck on Simcoe Island and watch the cable laying process		No response required
30 May 2007	• Has been cottaging on Horseshoe Island for 57 years, relies on renewable energy • Currently uses solar panels, but has been looking into wind power • As a result, has become more than casually informed on the subject • Believes the process the community is faced with is flawed and should be stopped immediately • When a project is proceeding through the approval	June 6, 2007	• Thank you for your comments resulting from the POHs for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, held on March 27 and 28, 2007 Provided link to Project's website and direct link to POH panels • Due to high level of community interest CREC has made the harmonized EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA - beyond the

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	mechanism based on limited results from inappropriate environmental and social studies, coupled with a municipal council where 50% plus members have to refrain from the decision making process because of conflict of interest, you have a problem • This process must them go before a full OMB review with CHD required to divulge all of their data for a proper evaluation by all concerned parties		formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP • Provided locations where EA is available for viewing • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence: Public Consultation and Information Disclosure • In the meantime, if you have any questions or comments with regards to the DRAFT EA or the Project in general, feel free to contact us directly • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007.
May 20, 2007	• Thanks for your prompt reply • From your email it seems that your solution to the problem is for me to subscribe to satellite TV, cable TV, move from my location, or move the transmitter, none of these should be my responsibility in the event that your installation create the problems	July 13 2007	• Thank you for your comments resulting from the POHs for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, held on March 27 and 28, 2007 Provided link to Project's website and direct link to POH panels • Due to high level of community interest CREC has made the harmonized EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA - beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP • Provided locations where EA is available for viewing • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence: Television signals – Main Report, Section 7.12.2.2 • CREC has commissioned a communications report that analyzes the Project's potential effects on communications systems. This report will be referenced and included as an appendix in the FINAL EA once it is completed.

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
			• Again, we do not anticipate any disruption to television signals in the United States as a result of the Project. Since it is considered highly unlikely that the Project will affect television reception in the United States, at this time CREC has no plans for compensation in this regard.
May 30, 2007	• thank you for information on cable particulars • just a quick last few questions • what is approximate distance out from landfill will the cable be trenched in? • will it be the same distance at both ends • how far to the East from Snake Island will it lie?	June 6, 2007	• Thank you for your comments resulting from the POHs for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, held on March 27 and 28, 2007 Provided link to Project's website and direct link to POH panels • Due to high level of community interest CREC has made the harmonized EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA - beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP • Provided locations where EA is available for viewing • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence: Submarine Transmission Line • In the meantime, if you have any questions or comments with regards to the DRAFT EA or the Project in general, feel free to contact us directly • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30 p.m. on 29 June 2007.
May 30, 2007	• In response to WIRE • Your petition is an excellent move forward in the fight against wind turbines • I support coal for a primary energy source in Ontario • Feel Canadian coal industry would suffer a severe set back if wind turbines are built		No response required

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	• Would like to prevent construction of wind turbines, and support construction of a coal plant on Wolfe Island • Would hope WIRE would consider joining his group "Wolfe Island Resident for Clean Air" WIRCA		
	• sent resume to CHD	June 21 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the WI wind project. Your information has been passed onto CHD for future consideration.
June 4, 2007	• tried to view EA online, was not successful due to missing or poorly formatted documents • should point out that its very difficult to read most of the main page since the white background only extends part way down the page, and blue text on green background is difficult to read • this comment applies to all of your other web pages as well	June 4, 2007	• Thank you for letting us know about the technical difficulties • File size of the report is extremely large, which is why you are having difficulties viewing it • Our IT staff are trying to remedy this • Anticipate this will be fixed in near future
June 4, 2007	• thanks for quick response • with due respect, it isn't the file size • the PDF itself seems to be incompatible with the Apple PDF viewer • have just transferred this PDF to a Linux system and am now able to view the submarine cable route using the xpdf viewer		No response required
June 6, 2007	• City of Kingston will be playing host to Communities in Bloom • Would like to know if you are interested in having a display at the Meet and Greet		Information passed to CREC
June 6, 2007	• Wind Power Development Tutorial 2007 -- Denver, CO		No response required
June 8, 2007	• I would like to approach you for sponsorship for this conference. • Furthermore, I would like to invite you to give a seminar at		

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	NTYLC 2008: going green at Queen's! • You may wish to talk about current projects you are leading, or any steps Hydro One has taken to ensure responsible engineering.		
June 8, 2007	• Thank you for the information about the proposed construction of windmills. It is very important that the migration patterns of birds be taken into account in the siting of the turbines. • I am not a bird expert and do not have the knowledge to assess the proposal. I hope you can find the authorities to help you out. David Suzuki		No response required
25 June 2007	• Permanent resident of WI • There is considerable discord in the community as a result of the debate over the proposed wind farm • Would be useful to hold several small meetings during month of July to create some meaningful, moderated conversation. • Suggest 3 or 4 small meetings of no more than 15 stakeholders in order to allow the conversation to be deeper than surface issues that have been raised at the town hall meetings • Meetings should include representatives from Stantec, CanHydro, the Frontenacs and the Islands Council, the Ontario Government and WI residents • As a resident, I want the opportunity to talk to you instead of merely submitting my comments by email or mail • I am willing to volunteer my time to organize the meetings	29 June 2007	• Thank you for submitting suggestion for small meetings about the WI wind project, and for using this venue for submitting comments on the DRAFT EA • Public consultation for the Project has been ongoing for several years and has encouraged dialogue, comments, and ideas from all stakeholders (please refer to Chapter 5 of the Draft EA). Several lines of communication have been open (e.g., webmail, telephone, fax, Public OpenHouses) to receive and provide as much information as possible on the Project • Such a large volume of very detailed questions and comments were received following the March 2007 Public Open Houses, that CREC decided to voluntarily release the Draft EA for public review, to enable the incorporation of as much information and feedback from the public as possible during preparation of the Final EA. • we are still welcoming comments from all stakeholders on the Draft report, and will consider all comments received during preparation of the final report. Once the final report is prepared, it will be released for

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
			another 30-day stakeholder review period sometime this summer. • strongly encourage you to submit your comments on the Draft EA so that we can make sure they're considered in time for incorporation into the final EA. Thank you again for your interest in the Project.
July 12, 2007	• Forwarded correspondence to the Township of Frontenac Islands regarding their disagreement with how the zoning by-law was amended.		No response required
27 July 2007	• Do you have a map (or link) to where the turbines are to be placed?	27 July 2007	• Provided direct link to Figure 2.4 Project Layout • Provided Project's website address • Provided link to access all Project figures
08 August 2007	• Where will the nearest wind turbines be to Easy Lane?	09 August 2007	• We have measured distance between turbine #34 and Easy Lane, which is approximately 540 m. • Please view attached pdf, a modified version of the report figure 2.4 Project Layout, for which I sent you the link 27 July 2007 • Please note the attached figure has added the street name, Easy Lane, as well as an 'X' 'at the intersection of Easy Lane and 3rd Line. The 'X' indicates the location from which the distance to turbine #34 was measured.
09 August 2007	• Thanks for the info re: Easy Lane. • Is your company planning on putting wind turbines in the northeast part of the Island?	10 August 2007	• Turbines are scheduled to be located only with the Study Area • I believe you are referring to the northeast part of the Island which falls outside of the Study Area, therefore, no turbines are proposed to be sited in that location • There is no planned second phase of the Project, the turbine layout in Figure 2.4 Project Layout, and the modified Figure 2.4 which I sent you yesterday, represents the current proposed locations for turbines

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
			• Turbine locations are subject to change, within the Study Area, through Ministry comments upon the completion of the Environmental Assessment
10 August 2007	• understand you have purchased a house and land at 115 County Rd #24 in Prince Edward County • wondering if you were interested in severing off the house and a small lot and possibly us purchasing it.		CREC responded to inquiry
23 August 2007	• Provided sitings of hundreds of monarchs, male/female blue herons, purple martins, and an osprey nest on WI	24 August 2007	• Thank you for sharing this information with us. • Please be advised that we are passing your sitings on to our ecologists. • We welcome any future information on wildlife observations you encounter.
25 Sept 2007	• Can you please provide employment opportunities in construction or maintenance.	28 Sept 2007	• In response to your 25 September 2007 email, there will be several employment opportunities provided throughout the lifecycle of the Wolfe Island Wind Project. The construction phase will require a peak labour force of approximately 225 people, and an average labour force of roughly 175 people. The operation phase will employ approximately 8 full time technicians and two full time managers. • If you are looking for employment opportunities, please feel free to send us your resume and we will be happy to forward it to Canadian Hydro Developers.
28 Sept 2007	• Thank you for your reply. • I was inquiring for my son-in-law, who is a construction worker, and an American Citizen. My daughter, who is Canadian and my son-in-law, would like to move to Canada but would need a Work Visa in order to do so. • Do you know if this is possible through the Wolfe Island Wind Project?	01 October 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the Project. • For questions regarding obtaining a work visa, I suggest speaking to your local Member of Parliament. • Your MP should then be able to direct you to the appropriate government agency who will be able to provide information for you or your son-in-law.
01 October 2007	• Thank you, that is good advice and such an opportune time with the elections coming up.		No response required

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
11 October 2007	• I am the outdoor education teacher at the Quintilian Private School of Kingston, and I am hoping to do a session on renewable energy, focusing particularly on windmills and wind power. I am not sure whether construction of the wind farm has started yet, but I am wondering there is any sort of educational tour or session that I could book for my group of students. • We are hoping to come to the island on October 19th. There are 7 students and 3 teaching staff. Please let me know if there are any possibilities to arrange a session.	23 October 2007	• We sincerely apologize for the delay in our response to your email below. We are currently still undergoing the ESP for the Project. Construction of the Project is therefore not expected to begin until spring 2008, so there are currently no Project-related tours being offered on the Island by CREC • We have spoken to Rob Miller, Project Engineer with CREC in Kingston. Mr. Miller would be happy to offer a presentation to your class in the future. • Again, we apologize for not responding to you sooner, we hope that your day on the Island was a successful one! If you have any further questions about the Project, please feel free to contact us directly.

2.1.2 Comments Received by Phone, Fax, and Mail

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
May 4, 2007	• Writing to register support for Frontenac and Islands Council members who have been elected to oversee the development of the wind turbines project on WI • Writing to convey concerns about a self-appointed, unelected group of individuals on the island who, who choosing to hide behind their organization and mail box # misrepresent themselves as speaking for "Wolfe Island Residents for the Environment", offering errors of fact, or confusing fact and opinion • I am a full time resident and taxpayer on the Island and a keen	June 4, 2007	• Participation and feedback from members of the community is a very important part of the Environmental Screening Process. Thank you very much for taking the time to register your positive support for the Wolfe Island Wind Project. • Thank you for your comments on the WI wind project • All information presented at the POH available on Project website • Draft EA is available for viewing on the project website, and in hard copy – provided list of locations

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	supporter of this initiative. My interest in windpower is not business related nor do I intend to derive financial benefit from the project in any way. I none-the-less resent WIRE. This group does not represent me or many of my fellow islanders or persons interested in and supportive of the initiative as the best of imperfect options. • The anonymous critics organizing the defeat of the project are criticizing the timing of Council approval but, to my knowledge, did not bother to attend meetings or comment publicly to convey their concerns. • It has been suggested that some individuals among the unnamed opponents may have a conflict of interest – in professional positions that would gain by litigation or the demise of the project. • The opponents, who would seem not to have the courage to be identified may have prevented a worthy initiative and disallowed the opportunities for WI because the funds may well have been directed to other initiatives.		
May 7, 2007 Response to Mayor Jim Vanden Hoek's April 25 letter	• Would like to respond to your April 25 letter where you justify Council's position on approving By-law 27-2006 • The fact that this issue is before the OMB speaks to the Public's opinion that Council has erred and the process has not been transparent nor open • On two occasions, Council (you) stated that council would not consider passing the bylaw until after the ESR was completed. Had I known Council would not honor its commitment, I would have attended every Council meeting and filed an appeal • Perception of many is that Council favours turning the Island into a hydro industrialized operation, from a tranquil, agricultural, and growing residential community.		No response required

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	• Massive change needs to be put to a vote by all WI tax payers • Your statement that tax bills sent to all property owners included an insert explaining the project and approvals process is inaccurate. My husband and I did not receive a letter, nor did many seasonal residents I checked with • Inaccurate display panels and the lack of ESR all purported to support a failed attempt to inform the public • Lack of responses to concerns by CREC should have raised Council's concern • Using the holding provision to correct your error in passing the by-law without the ESR is unprecedented and is not the intent of a 'holding provision' • It is unfortunate that Council is only seeing the financial gain for a small number of landowners, without knowing or considering the global impact to the Island		
May 8, 2007	• What do each of the revenue sources mean? • Who gets what, and for how long? • I understand that Howe Island gets 40% of the amenities agreement, is that correct?	May 9 2007	• Landowner royalties: annual lease payments for use of private land that turbines and ancillary structures sit on. A landowner can select either a fixed annual payment, or a royalty payment based on the energy produced by a specific turbine (hence the range) • Property Tax: The property taxes payable were calculated and estimated on the basis of the prevailing industrial property tax rates in the affected municipalities. Assuming current rates, the Project is estimated to pay $552,000 in property taxes annually. The $552,000 will be paid approximately as follows: • $111,000 to Township of Frontenac Islands • $51,000 to County of Frontenac • $390,000 to education (School Boards) • Township amenities agreement: The $645,000 per year is above and beyond landowner payments and municipal taxes. In

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
			essence, it is simply $7,500 per year per turbine on a total of 86 turbines • 'Who gets what' is outlined above. The landowner royalties, property taxes, and amenities agreement will all continue for the life of the project, estimated at 30 -40 years • The Township of Frontenac Islands Council decides, how the monies from the Amenities Agreement will be allocated; we assume based on the needs of the Township. At this time, as no monies have changed hands, it would not be appropriate for us to speculate on how the Council will allocate the monies from this agreement other than to note the monies are to be used for community betterment projects and services
08 May 2007	• We met at Public Open House, he thanked me for the maps of where the wind turbines are going to be. • He has one question for us, although we're probably aware of it • Up on the head of the Island, he sees a lot of rough-legged hawk activity (numerous pairs) – wants to know if they'd be in migration right now. • KH said that she would check with the birders and call him back. • KH called him back and let him know that the hawks have been there all winter, and that they would be leaving the Island soon. • He thanked me for the information.		No response required
May 11, 2007	• I had planned to sit down and put together my response to the notice I got in the mail from "Wolfe Island Residents for the Environment" and then I received in the mail today the attached letter from a resident. He says it all. I have nothing to add except perhaps some of the thought found in another resident's letter to the editor of the Whig, which I also attach.	June 4, 2007	• Participation and feedback from members of the community is an important part of the Environmental Screening Process. Thank you very much for taking the time to register your positive support for the Wolfe Island Wind Project. • Thank you for your comments on the WI wind project • All information presented at the POH available on Project

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	• The top line on the notice from "WIRE" says "serving the community – preserving the environment'. How better to serve the community and preserve the environment than by promoting clean renewable energy. • I support the Wolfe Island Wind Project		website • Draft EA is available for viewing on the project website – provided list of locations
May 19, 2007	• Provided information on Wind Turbine Syndrome	June 6, 2007	• Thank you for submitting your letter dated May 19, 2007 • Due to high level of community interest, CREC has made the DRAFT ERR available for stakeholder review and comment • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA, beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP • The DRAFT EA is available for viewing on the Project's website, and for hard copy at the following locations • With respect to your specific comments you submitted, the following section of the DRAFT EA address your specific concerns: Public health and safety, project setbacks, environmental noise • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30pm on 29 June 2007
May 28, 2007	• Has a constituent with some concerns about the Project, was looking for information to be able to write them back • KH let her know that Stantec has received several letters from the constituent, in process of drafting a letter • Asked about project schedule, KH said no construction can happen until all approvals had been obtained, target is fall 2007 • Asked about low frequency noise, KH said low frequency noise is phenomenon with older models of turbines, newer models have		No response required

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	rectified the problem • Asked about setbacks, KH said 350 m setback is minimum that was established as part of planning process during zoning by-law amendment by Township		
30 May 2007	• Has been cottaging on Horseshoe Island for 57 years, relies on renewable energy • Currently uses solar panels, but has been looking into wind power • As a result, has become more than casually informed on the subject • Believes the process the community is faced with is flawed and should be stopped immediately • When a project is proceeding through the approval mechanism based on limited results from inappropriate environmental and social studies, coupled with a municipal council where 50% plus members have to refrain from the decision making process because of conflict of interest, you have a problem • This process must them go before a full OMB review with CHD required to divulge all of their data for a proper evaluation by all concerned parties		• Due to the high level of community interest in this renewable energy initiative, CREC has made the draft EA available in DRAFT form for stakeholder review and comment. • This approach provides stakeholders with the benefit of an additional four weeks of consultation on the EA, beyond the formal ESP requirements, and continues to demonstrate CREC's commitment to undertaking a rigorous and transparent ESP • The following sections of the DRAFT EA address the comments made in your correspondence: Public Consultation and Information Disclosure, Permits and Approvals • The DRAFT EA is available for viewing on the Project's website, and for hard copy at the following locations • Stakeholder comments on the DRAFT EA will be received by Stantec on or before 4:30pm on 29 June 2007
May 30 2007	• WHO supports the view that noise should not exceed 20dBA	May 31, 2007	• I am going to review the WHO 30dBA • I have attached the NPC-232 for your review and reference, which describes the 40dBA limit and 'background sound levels of the natural environment' • This is regulation we are working under, and ultimately what the MOE will use in order to issue and govern out CofA
01 June 2007	• Received letter we sent regarding POH, he believes WTG on his neighbour's property is too close, we provided answers to		

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	WTG 81, but he was concerned about WTG 40 • Told him that someone from Stantec or CREC would get back to him as soon as possible		
04 June 2007	• Wondering if foundation package/civil works package had already been awarded	04 June 2007	• KLH called back, it has not been awarded, KLH took down contact details and will pass the info onto the company doing the tendering process
05 June 2007	• Media – KH referred him to Preston Stuart Communications		No response required
June 6, 2007	• Writing this letter on behalf of two residents on WI who are not interested in participating in the Project (temporary access road intended to run across their property) • Any further unsolicited or unannounced calls or visits will be viewed as harassment		No response required
25 June 2007	• Left message • Wanted to know if there is a bid list for the transportation for the Project • And if he can be put on the list, is there a form that needs to be filled out? • Provided contact information		No response required
25 June 2007	• During our meeting last November, you had requested a copy of our bird report, once it was completed • We have now completed the draft EA which has been released for public review and comment • Copies of the report can be found at the WI library, the township	25 June 2007	• Thanks! • I do hope your report was also informed by WI people, who have bought land at the WI head just to preserve and enhance that major migratory path • You will know there is a major anti-wind mills group active on WI

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	office or online • We would welcome any comment you have on the report		• It's all about wild life migration but also about the very shallow soil at the head which will mean overhead cables • I will look at your report at the WI library • For your interest, our tri-island council voted in the necessary by-law to permit windmills • I was at the meeting last Nov or Dec • On a 3 island council, we have 5 elected councilors, 3 from WI, the other 2 being from Howe Island, the 3 from WI declared themselves in conflict of interest, as all have options for wind mills. Two Howe Island councilors, personally unaffected, voted in favour of the by-law!
11 July 2007	• Has taken thousands, perhaps millions of years for wildlife to adapt to life here in our corner of the world • A hasty decision on the implementation of the windmills could turn our corner of paradise into an industrial wasteland • No decision should be made without a full environmental study • It is said that for health and safety, windmills should be set back 2 km from any human habitation • Believe current plan would have three wind turbines set back only half a km from my home • New research has uncovered a potential malady, called Wind Turbine Syndrome • Unless it can be medically and scientifically proven that windmills are safe, they should be located far from human habitation • Do not rush to the lure of a new technology without study • Do not be lured by tax revenues at the expense of the environment and human health		No response required

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
12 July 2007	• Writing in hopes of receiving some encouraging news that this regressive challenge has been dismissed. (referring to OMB by-law challenge) • As a long-time advocate of wind energy, I am looking forward to the beautiful sight of these turbines near Kingston. • We collectively need to be much more progressive in our thinking about renewable energy sources • I understand if you cannot say anything at this juncture if the challenge is not over, please let me know where I might find up-to-date news of the progress that is being made on the project as the media are not always prompt in relaying such information	13 July 2007	• It was a pleasure speaking with you today • thank you for your support • if you ever have future comments or questions, you can always call or email me, and or comment through the Project's email
12 July 2007	• As mentioned, AAER Inc. is a Canadian wind turbine manufacturer • Would be interested in having opportunity to provide you with a proposal for the supply of turbines for the WIWIP • Could you let us know who we should contact in order to be pre-qualified as a potential supplier for this project?	13 July 2007	• Thank you for your interest in the WIWP • In response to your question, I have spoken with Mr. Geoff Carnegie of CHD and I provide you with this information on his behalf • Purchase agreements for Siemens model Mark II 2.3 MW turbines for the WIWP and GE 1.5 MW sle model turbines for the Melancthon II Wind Project are currently in place • For future inquiries about turbines supply, Mr. Rob Miller of CHD would be please to assist you.
13 July 2007	• GL left KLH a voice mail • GL is a filmmaker, and is doing a documentary on the Project. • Has a few questions about the project • KLH passed info on to Preston Stuart Communications for follow up.		Information passed on to Preston Stuart Communications
27 July 2007	• Stakeholder attended OMB hearing, said it was a good meeting, and herself and many others are very happy with the outcome	27 July 2007	• As per our telephone conversation on 27 July 2007, please find enclosed two of each of the following maps from the Draft ERR/

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	• Asked if she could have a couple hard copies of the Project layout maps • Stakeholder believes there are several turbines that will no longer comply with the new setbacks as a result of the OMB hearing and will hopefully have to be removed • KH told her that checking the layout is part of what CREC will be doing now as follow up to the hearing, can't promise that they'll be removed, but can promise the final turbine locations will comply with the new setbacks • Stakeholder wanted to have the following turbines double-checked: 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 73, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 • Seeing the setback map presented at the OMB, she believes that the woodland and creek near her house have been underrepresented – they are bigger than it shows on the map, and so the setbacks will not be accurate in the real world • Stakeholder's biggest question is about the protocols/procedures for residents during operation, in the event of a situation • Stakeholder feels she would rest easier if she knew what she's supposed to do in the event that there's a problem • Example she used is shadow flicker on the school (also mentioned ice throw) – she acknowledges that it may never happen, but if there is a problem should would like to know who to call/contact (she's wondering if it would be CHD's head office in Calgary, or if she'll have to drive to the O&M building), and whether or not in an extreme event like this CHD would be able to shut down a turbine. KH explained that residents will be given contact information for CREC during the operations phase, but that KH would see if she could get some more information for her		EIS • Figure 2.4 – Project Layout • Figure 2.5 – Project Layout and Key Environmental Features

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	• Will pass on her request to double check the turbines she listed, and try to gather some information for her and call her back as soon as possible		
30 July 2007	• Called from MVSG, who do electrical and construction consulting on wind projects • Based in West Virginia • KLH passed information on to CPL, said that someone would call him back to answer his questions about tendering.		Passed information to CPL
30 July 2007	• My family has lived for many years on the US side of the AT. Lawrence River in Cape Vincent NY and it has been our privilege to be graced by the lovely setting • I have thought many times how well the natural resources of Canada have been managed as evidence by the natural beauty of WI • I am writing to ask that you protect the beautiful shoreline and pristine beauty of nature while allowing the wind turbine development • St. Lawrence River as it flows from Lake Ontario is one of the most beautiful locations in the world, and I believe that it is a common good duty to protect this asset as the treasure that it is while allowing reasonable development • Believe setbacks calculated to preserve viewsheds are clearly in the common interest • Setting of nature is also an historical setting in exploration and in the development of Canada and the US and of relations between		No response required

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	the two countries • Writing to suggest and indeed beg that you take fully into account the aesthetic and historical assets of your lovely island and protect these assets by full setbacks calculated to preserve • Viewsheds and a sense of historical sites in allowing reasonable and proper development		
07 August 2007	• Understand your firm will be involved with the above-noted project • In connection with this project we would like to offer the following services (Geotechnical investigation, environmental site assessment, hydrology, construction materials engineering, inspection and testing, pavements and asphalt technology, roofing engineering evaluations and inspections, building sciences technology, concrete technology, demolition supervision, asbestos and mould surveys)		
26 August 2007	• Wondered if there had been any rethinking, revision of the WI project layout since the plan presented in March 2007? • I am personally concerned with the placement of turbine #79 which appears to be about .30 miles from the 1 acre lot where I want to build on Reeds Bay Rd. Turbine #42 also seems too close to avoid the adverse health effects likely when turbines are less than 1 ½ miles from locations where people live. • Are CH staff giving any meaningful consideration to the environmental and health concerns presented by Wolfe Island residents?	29 August 2007	• As Geoff Carnegie is away from the office this week, he has requested that Stantec Consulting respond to your email of 26 August 2007. • We are the consultants retained by CREC to complete the provincial and federal environmental assessment requirements Since May 2007, the draft EA has been released fro public and agency review and comment • The Draft EA contains the most up-to-date turbine layout, as well as provides information on potential health effects. • The following sections of the draft EA address the comments made in your correspondence and may be of interest to you: Project Layout – Figure 2.4 Health and Safety – Main Report, Section 7.16 • At this time, all comments received from stakeholders are being

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
			addressed in the final EA as appropriate. Following the completion of the final EA, it will be released to all stakeholders for the formal 30 day Notice of Completion review and comment period. • As a member of the Project stakeholder list, you will be notifi3ed when the final EA is released.
30 August 2007	• Located in Ogdensburg, NY, their facilities are near Wolfe Island. • They are interested in having their facilities used for the unloading/reloading of turbines. • KLH said that contact info would be provided to CPL, who is handling the logistics for the project, and that someone from CPL or CREC would get in touch with him.		Contact information passed onto CPL
07 Sept 2007	• Noticed the issue we had discussed at the open house (collector lines had originally been planned along Hwy 96) had been relocated to south of the properties at her request – she's very happy and thanks us very much • Is now looking at the collector line / access road that runs south of her property, connecting WTGs 6 – 14 to 4th Line. She would like to see that collector line and access road removed, and instead have several shorter collector lines and access roads running south to Baseline Road. Since Baseline Road already exists, it would be less intrusive to have all lines running to that road, rather than having traffic running along the southern boundary of her property. • KH told her that there are often very good reasons for how the lines and roads are planned, but KH would check with siting experts and find out if it can be changed, and if not, why it was planned that way. KH will call her back with the information when she gets it. • KH was planning on following up with her on our August		KH passed question regarding siting of access roads and collector lines to siting team

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	conversation, where I was chasing down some information for her: • She had asked me to have a list of WTGs double checked for setbacks following the OMB hearing – that information was passed on. She thanked me for passing on the request. • She had asked me to find out more information on who to contact if she had a complaint during construction and operation. KH told her that we were working to provide more information on that in the Final EA. There may not be a finalized Protocol available at that point – it may be developed later on in the detailed design phase, but that there would certainly be a phone number for her to call 24 hours a day. She was happy that more information would be provided, and that she would have someone to call at any time. • KH told her that she was still following up on her question about the woodlot mapping, and that she would get back to her. She was still concerned about the creek mapping, and wanted to know when the MNR had done surveys for the drainage mapping on the Island. KH did not know, but she said that she has already been trying to contact the MNR to find out, and would continue to track that information down from them. She wants to make sure that their mapping reflects the creeks in spring.		
19 Sept 2007	• Stakeholder called to see if KH had any information for her. KH told her she had just received some info for her, she called at a great time. • KH explained that the change to the access road and t-line that she had requested was not possible, as it would require 3 additional watercourse crossings and a wetland crossing. • She was not happy, and said that this road and t-line will cause too much interruption and disruption to her property and way of life. This is an unacceptable layout for the project. We will need to get		• Passed questions regarding moving access road and t-line to run south to Baseline Road • Passed questions regarding how deep the foundations for WTG 1, 2, 10 will be drilled.

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	permission for watercourse crossings anyway, and she does not understand what the big deal is to add these ones. • She made it very clear that if her neighbours want the project, then fine, but that she should not be inconvenienced by their project. • She wants to know the distance between her fenceline and the access road / t-line. KHtold her that the scale of the mapping for the EA makes this level of detail impossible to see on the map, but that KH can check on the site plan process, or with the project siting team and see if that information is available • Stakeholder believes that the access road and t-line are adjacent to the creek, and is concerned that the water will be impacted during construction. KH explained that, like on any other construction project, there are very basic and routine mitigation measures that will be used to protect the watercourse. The line and road would not be immediately adjacent to the creek, and there would be many measures taken, such as fencing, etc. to make sure that the creek is not impacted. She seemed satisfied with this. • Stakeholder requests that the access road and t-line for the turbines in question connect with 2nd Line, run south to Baseline Rd. This would avoid the road/t-line from running along her fenceline. KH told her she would check on this possibility for her. • Stakeholder would like to know how deep the foundations will be for WTG 1, 2, and 10. There is a spring in that area that feeds the creek, and the digging required for those turbines have the potential to disturb the spring, which may dry up the creek and wetland. I told her that I would check on the geotechnical results for those 3 turbines and get back to her. • Overall, stakeholder is very unhappy with the Project layout, and		

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	thinks that WTG 1-10 should be removed or relocated. If there is any turbine that requires a watercourse crossing, then it is an improperly sited turbine and should be removed or relocated.		
24 Sept 2007	• Stakeholder was concerned that there would be overhead lines over the creek in her area. She opposes that plan since CREC said that the lines would be underground. KH told her that she wasn't positive on the plan for those particular watercourse crossings, but that it was very possible that they may be directionally drilled rather than crossed with overhead lines. • KH told her that she had also received some information for her about the turbine foundations – although the specifics were not planned yet, they are estimated to be about 3 m deep. Stakeholder was surprised that they would be so shallow. KH explained that all appropriate building codes are followed when constructing the turbines, and we agreed that it's quite the feat of engineering. • Stakeholder does not believe that the project layout is a good one – the turbines are clumped rather than in a line or grid pattern. Stakeholder did not believe that the wind energy could be harnessed properly with this current layout, and does not have faith in the people that are planning the layout. • KH told stakeholder that I would continue to pass on her message that she would like turbines 1 to 5 removed. • KH told stakeholder to feel free to call if she has any more questions.		• Passed on message to siting team that stakeholder would like turbines 1 – 5 removed
28 Sept 2007	• stakeholder would like to get a better understanding of how the baseline noise levels are determined on the Island (time of year study is done, time of day, equipment, etc.). She would like to know where measurements were taken, and if they were chosen to		• Obtained information from noise experts, called stakeholder back on 04 October 2007

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	provide a worst case scenario. • When cleaning up the gym after the OMB Hearing, stakeholder found a map left behind that has created some concern for her. Apparently it has some noise information on it for the head of the Island, near Hwy 96, where she lives. The map said that the noise results were based on a worst-case scenario, which included modelling NE winds. Stakeholder says that the prevailing winds on the Island are SW winds. Her house is on Hwy 96, just north of WTG 1-6. She believes that the noise from these turbines will be louder at her house with the prevailing SW winds. She is therefore questioning whether the noise analysis really did produce a worst case scenario. • I told her that I would gather some information for her from the noise experts on the Project, and call her back hopefully within the next week or so. She thanked me.		
01 October 2007	• I received your phone message today, requesting a copy of the most recent site plan map for the Wolfe Island Wind Project. I would like to clarify that site plans for the Project will be finalized following the completion of the Environmental Screening Process, and would be available from the Township of Frontenac Islands. If you were referring to a map of the most recent wind turbine layout for the Project, please refer to Figure 2.4 of the Draft Environmental Review Report / Environmental Impact Statement ("EA Report"), available at: http://www.canhydro.com/projects/wolfeislandwind/draft_EA_report.htm. • We are currently undergoing verification of the final turbine layout, which will be presented in the Final EA Report, anticipated to be released for the formal 30-day public comment		

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	period in the next couple months. I have added to you to the Project contact list, so you will receive an email notification when the Final EA Report is released. • Thank you for your interest in the Wolfe Island Wind Project. Please feel free to contact me if you have any other questions.		
04 Oct 2007	• Provided stakeholder with information on how the baseline, ambient noise data is collected for the modeling: • 6 sites chosen based on turbine layout and/or how representative they were for area- explained that site locations are provided in a table in ENIA appendix. • Sound level meters put out at each site, monitored continuously from Sep 21-Oct 7, 2006. This gave them 115-213 hours of continuous data. They measure over a long period of time to make sure they measured the worst case quietest single hour for use in modelling. • explained that spring and fall were best time of year to measure ambient noise (summer had higher traffic counts and insect noise, winter has harder ground cover, more precipitation, more wind). This made sense to stakeholder. • explained MOE classification system (Class 1 – Class 3), and told stakeholder that the monitoring results found Class 2 and 3 areas on Wolfe Island, but that to be even more conservative, all of Wolfe Island was considered Class 3 in modelling. • stakeholder thanked me, she feels she understands this much better. • stakeholder wanted to comment that the term “receptor” in EA Report was not well explained, and came across as being insulting, and that it produced a very negative reaction in community. I		• No response required

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	explained that the term is really a technical term of MOE and is used in terms of the noise modelling. I mentioned that in Final EA, some additional text has been written in the noise section to make that distinction clearer to the reader. • stakeholder mentioned that she has read a large portion of the EA, but that it is a huge amount of information to assimilate in 30 days. I agreed, and explained that this was in part why it was released for public review, which is not often done during the ESP. The high level of community interest, and large amount of information helped make the decision to release it. This gave the community the benefit of much additional time to read the report. I explained that although the comment period for draft EA was officially over, the report is still available for people to read. • Provided stakeholder with an explanation of map that she found, with modelling for NE wind: • Environmental noise is predicted for each of 12 different wind directions separately in 30 degree increments. • Each wind direction results in noise predictions for 256 receptors. The highest noise for each receptor is outlined in assessment summary Table 13 of ENIA. • The wind direction for the worst receptor for the entire project is wind blowing from 30 degrees, i.e. wind from northeast. • Each receptor has its own worst case wind direction, which is wind direction from its nearest turbine to receptor. This wind direction is downwind noise propagation. • highest noise level for each receptor, which represents the worst-case prediction for each receptor, is outlined in assessment summary Table 13 of ENIA.		

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	• worst case wind direction for the project (for the worst case receptor) is shown on noise contour map figures, which is possibly the type of map that she found at the hearing. • Stakeholder will have a look at the ENIA, to see about the results for her house • Stakeholder mentioned that she's been trying to educate herself about the different sound levels, and mentioned that 40 dB is the guideline, the highest level for the Project. I clarified that the dB guideline levels of the MOE do change with wind speed. Stakeholder was not aware of this. I told her that we have tried to clarify this concept in the Final EA, and went through the MOE wind speed vs. dBA table with her. I gave her the name of the MOE document, and she will find it on MOE website. • Stakeholder thanked me for the information, mentioned that she is the Vice-Chair of WIRE, and that she is aware that I know she is very concerned about the Project. • Stakeholder mentioned to me that one of WIRE's major concerns is release of the tax roll by Council. I explained that we have had a lot of feedback from residents about contacting seasonal residents on the Island, and that Council would grant us permission to use the tax roll for future notifications, as this is the only way that we are able to contact these residents. Stakeholder clarified that her problem is that WIRE had made a request to obtain the tax roll themselves, and used Rob Miller's exact request letter (just put WIRE information on it), and yet they were denied. Stakeholder explained that WIRE's information was just as important as CREC's for the seasonal residents. I told her that this was a Council decision, and that I was unable to comment on it. • Stakeholder explained that WIRE is often perceived as the enemy, but that they just want to be an information group. She		

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	understands the negativity in the community though, as she acknowledges that WIRE does have a negative view of the Project. However, she explained that as information is received by them, they try to present it truthfully. • Stakeholder thanked me again for taking the time to gather and provide this information to her. She will be passing on this information to WIRE on Tuesday night. She said that several members of WIRE, including herself, have not called me. She was very hesitant, thinking that contacting Stantec would not go this well. She is confident that I'll be hearing from her, and maybe other members of WIRE in the future.		
10 October 2007	• Stakeholder called to see how much longer it would be until the turbines were up • Lives in Kingston, thinks that it's a great spot to put a wind farm • The wind plant will be more of an attraction to people than anything else • Really doesn't see any problems with them, figures most people don't, but that you always get a few people that are going to be unhappy • Has been to Kincardine area, seen the turbines there • KLH explained that we're still in the EA process, looking to release final provincial EA in mid-November. After that, there is a federal EA process, and over 90 permits and approvals that need to be obtained before construction can begin • Stakeholder thanked me for the info, said she looks forward to them • KLH offered to put her on the stakeholder mailing list, so that she		• No response required

Date	Comments Received	Response	Date
	will receive a letter in the mail letter her know that EA is out for the formal 30-day review period. JG said yes, and provided address.		
18 October 2007	• contacting you in regards to Wolfe Island Wind Project • I am a wind turbine builder residing in Alberta • I have erected 100 turbines in the Lethbridge, AB, area for General Electric (U.S.A) and Enercon (Germany) where I was a rigger, erection foreman, and lift supervisor. I am wondering if I should forward my credentials to you for employment opportunities or if you would be kind enough to provide me with a contact for the same. • I thank you for your time and look forward to your response.		• Information forwarded to CREC
25 October 2007	• Called to find out the status of the Project timeline (has construction started yet, etc.) • TH is a travel technician for a competing wind turbine company, looking for possible employment with Canadian Hydro on the Wolfe Island Project • I told him he could send his info to me, and I'd be happy to pass it on to Canadian Hydro for consideration • He said that he would be near their head office in Alberta soon, he would go talk to them in person. If that doesn't happen, he'll get back in touch with me.		• No response required

2.2 COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EA

2.2.1 Comments from Public

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Stakeholder #1				
1 Stakeholder #1	Project webmail	06 June 2007	I am pro-wind but I am still very concerned about the health effects related to low frequency sound for residents within 1 mile of a turbine.	Potential health effects resulting from low frequency noise ("LFN") were discussed in Section 7.16 of the Draft EA. As explained in the report, research to date has not shown any biological health effects at levels normally associated with modern operational turbines. Please refer to Section 7.16.2.2 of the Final EA.
2 Stakeholder #1	Project webmail	06 June 2007	I am surprised to see that in your report on adverse health effects, only a concern with cancer is addressed.	The Draft EA also discussed potential health effects from electric and magnetic fields, shadow flicker, infrasound, low frequency noise, ice fall and throw etc. (please see Section 7.16 of the Final EA).
3 Stakeholder #1	Project webmail	06 June 2007	I am concerned with all the other health effects that are listed in peer reviewed medical journals - is there any information available in this report to address these health issues i.e. headaches, miagraine, depression, tinnitus, sleep deprivation etc.?	Since release of the Draft EA, Stantec has completed literature search of published, peer-reviewed scientific literature to determine if there is scientific evidence of modern wind plants causing these potential health effects. Please see Section 7.16.2 of the Final EA.
4 Stakeholder #1	Project webmail	06 June 2007	Will you increase the setbacks to prevent these adverse health effects?	Our research indicates that there is low potential for health effects as a result of the Project. The appropriateness of the Project setbacks was determined as part of the planning process, and an Ontario Municipal Board hearing was held in July 2007 on the topic.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Stakeholder #1	Project webmail	06 June 2007	I have a PO Box at the island post office and have yet to receive any information from anyone about this project.	Project notices were sent via unaddressed Canada Post Admail and should have been received by all mailing addresses on Wolfe Island. However, you have been added to the project mailing list.
Stakeholder #2				
1 Stakeholder #2	Project webmail	13 June 2007	In principle I am for wind energy. Personally, would like to be assured that the Project will not affect me, my family, or my property in a negative way.	Unfortunately, personal assurances cannot be made since some potential Project effects are subjective values (e.g., effects on viewscape). Stantec has prepared the environmental assessment based on available knowledge and field studies to determine potential effects in the Study Area, including potential effects to residents and property values – please see Section 7.16 (Public Health and Safety) and 7.14 (Economic Benefits; which includes the property value discussion) of the Final EA.
2 Stakeholder #2	Project webmail	13 June 2007	I have read the most recent report and I am concerned about the number of assumptions that take place in that report.	Detail regarding which specific assumptions you are concerned about would help us respond to your comments. It should be noted that environmental assessment, by nature, is somewhat uncertain since it involves assessing effects of a Project that is proposed, and has not been built. Making reasonable assumptions based on existing literature, the effects of similar projects, field studies, and professional judgment and experience is a necessary part of the process.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Stakeholder #3				
1 Stakeholder #3	Project webmail	14 June 2007	I request a list of summer residents that were provided with notification of Project, and confirmation as to who received notice information on the site plan of turbines for the Island and open house session.	We are unable to provide lists of contacts for this project since they contain personal information. However, a description of how residents have been notified for various ESP-related activities is located in Section 5.0 of the Draft EA and Section 5.0 of the Final EA. A Site Plan Bylaw will be in place and part of the planning process used by the Township of Frontenac Islands. Residents will have the opportunity to review and comment on the site plans based on the by-law to be approved by the Council of the Township of Frontenac Islands. In response to stakeholder feedback, the Township of Frontenac Islands Council has endorsed a resolution that allows CREC access to the mailing list for all MPAC registered property owners in the Township. This has allowed for a mailout of the notification of release of the Final EA to all landowners, including those that do not live on the Island.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
2 Stakeholder #3	Project webmail	14 June 2007	I request a list of the 256 non-receptors.	As mentioned in the response to Comment #1, we are unable to provide lists of contacts for the Project since they contain personal information. A "Receptor" is a definition used by the MOE for environmental noise impact assessments ("ENIAs"). A receptor is any building/structure (including residences) within 1000 m of a wind turbine. A "non-participating receptor" is the term used to describe any building/structure located on land that is not being used by the wind project (i.e., does not have a wind turbine on its property). Any noise produced by the project must meet the MOE noise criteria at each and every non-participating receptor, while the noise limits do not apply to participating receptors (i.e., landowners with a turbine on their property).
3 Stakeholder #3	Project webmail	14 June 2007	I request confirmation that 256 non-receptors were copied on possible negative effects of the turbines located near or adjacent to their property	All stakeholders had access to the Draft EA, which assessed the effects of the Project. Residents were notified as outlined in Section 5.0 of the Draft EA during various stages of the EA process. The Final EA has also been released for public review and comment.
4 Stakeholder #3	Fax	25 June 2007	Sent information on Vibro-Acoustic Disease and WIRE's petition to council, submitted 14 May 2007	We thank you for the additional information.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	See attached file – researched health studies and impacts of turbines to humans, wildlife and the environment. Document attached: “Presentation for Kingsville Public Meeting”	We thank you for the additional information.
6 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	To date, have not received answers from the Township, CREC, or Stantec re: emergency preparedness plan	The Draft EA contained information on the development of an Emergency Response Plan for the Project (please see Section 9.3.2.4). As stated in the Draft EA, the plan will be finalized at a later stage in Project planning, following the EA process.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
7 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	To date, have not received answers from the Township, CREC, or Stantec re: ferry transportation plan	As stated in the Draft EA (Section 7.15.3), CREC has been continuing to examine various options for the transportation of Project components and workers to and from the Island. More detail on traffic management is now available, and is provided in Section 7.15, Technical Appendix C15, and Technical Appendix I of the Final EA.
8 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	To date, have not received answers from the Township, CREC, or Stantec re: impacts to island dump	Section 7.19 of the Final EA has been updated to provide more detailed information on the disposal of waste during construction and operation. The Island landfill will only be used for the permitted waste in which it accepts, which does not include construction material. Effects to the landfill during operation are expected to be negligible.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
9 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	To date, have not received answers from the Township, CREC, or Stantec re: proper setbacks. No scientific studies were used to support setbacks.	Setbacks outlined in the Zoning By-law are prescribed by the local municipality, and are used as absolute minimums during the siting process. Actual setbacks are often larger than these minimums, and include incorporating noise guideline requirements set out by the MOE. The appropriateness of the Project setbacks was determined as part of the planning process, and an Ontario Municipal Board hearing was held in July 2007 on the topic. Please refer to Section 2.5.5.2 of the Final EA. A field survey was completed to examine potential effects from the Project on natural features in selected areas of the Island where a natural feature was relatively close to the minimum setback. This survey and its results are discussed in the main report Section 7.3, 7.8, 7.10 and Technical Appendix C7 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
10 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	By-laws were passed without the EA to allow an open and transparent process for public debate. Council mislead the Islanders by stating they would not make decisions until the EA was released to the public for debate	The details related to the passing of the Zoning By-law amendment are under municipal jurisdiction and this amendment is part of the planning process. Disputes regarding the Zoning By-law have been resolved at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing in July 2007.
11 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	Open House sessions were held without the EA. No information pertaining to the impacts to people, wildlife or the environment were provided at these sessions.	Usually, the EA report is not available before or during Public Open Houses. EA is an iterative process that includes public consultation, and the EA report includes information and feedback obtained from the public during the open houses. General information on many topics was presented and discussed, and many project team representatives of various roles and specialties attended in order to answer as many questions as possible.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
12 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	Letters, dated April 2nd and 18th, written to Stantec to provide answers to questions regarding noise, water table impacts, turbine lighting, vibrations, ferry management, property value assessments and compensation, all were responded to by Stantec stating that "we are preparing an assessment, and at this time it is anticipated that the ERR will be released in the summer of 2007".	We respectfully disagree. The response letter from Stantec, dated 01 May 2007, provided information on each issue or question submitted. In order to keep you updated on Project activities, the letter also mentioned the estimated timeline for the release of the Final EA – at that time anticipated to be summer of 2007.
13 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	The proponent did not provide the information to the public in the time and manner in which an open and transparent process was demonstrated to the public. In fact, these open house sessions were never publicly evaluated, and if the consulting firm had bothered to request an evaluation by the public, of their Open House process, they would have known this was a failure and not a successful dissemination of information to a primary stakeholder group i.e. public.	As described in Section 5.0 of the Draft EA (Final EA – Section 5.0), public consultation for the Project has been ongoing for several years. Consultation has included several well attended and successful Public Open Houses, from which large volumes of feedback were received from the public. A large number of project representatives, representing various roles and specialties, attended the Public Open Houses. This enables for a very large amount of information to be disseminated in a given period of time – many questions can be answered concurrently.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
14 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	I am one of 800 seasonal residents that were not notified by the developer, the consulting firm nor council, that wind turbines were proposed for the Island, no siting plan, nor even received the Mayor's letter stating his biased approval of the proposal!	As described in Section 5.0 of the Draft EA (Final EA – Section 5.0), public consultation for the Project has been ongoing for several years. Please note that any person who has shown an interest in the Project during that time has been added to the project contact list, and is sent notices directly. In response to stakeholder feedback, the Township of Frontenac Islands Council has endorsed a resolution that allows CREC access to the mailing list for all MPAC registered property owners in the Township. This has allowed for a mailout of the notification of release of the Final EA to all landowners, including those that do not live on the Island.
15 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	My property is zoned "Limited Use Residential", yet the EA, and in Stantec's letter to me of May 1, 2007, states that "in preparing this assessment we have conservatively assumed all areas within the wind plant siting area are "RURAL", as defined by MOE for noise compliance.	The assumption that all areas on Wolfe Island are rural in nature is used for the purposes of modeling noise impacts using the MOE guidelines. The EA clearly states this in Section 7.71. Please note that although the EA describes and maps land-use designations on the Island, as provided in the Official Plan for the Township of Frontenac Islands (see main report Section 7.5.1, and for mapping see Appendix C6), it does not discuss or map the zoning of properties on the Island. When characterizing the Island community, the EA makes it clear that there are residential areas on the Island – please refer to Section 7.5.1.1.3.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
16 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	I still have not received an answer as to whether MOE has upgraded their compliance standards to test concurrently both the blade noise and the turbine generator noise at the bottom of the turbine. Previous projects indicated that this was not done, and required MOE to revoke a noise approval, AFTER the turbine was up.	We are unable to provide responses for the MOE, and suggest that you contact them directly to discuss their standards and guidelines.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
17 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	The EA indicates there are 256 non-participating receptors located within the project. Since I will be living under these turbines I can only assume I am a "non-receptor" and an identified stakeholder in the EA process. Yet, no one has contacted me to notify me that I will be directly impacted, and what those negative impacts will be.	“Receptor” and “non-participating receptors” are definitions used by the MOE in their environmental noise guidelines, and are used in the environmental noise impact assessment (“ENIA”). A receptor is any building/structure within 1000 m of a wind turbine. A non-participating receptor is the term used to describe any building/structure located on land that is not being used by the wind project (i.e., does not have a wind turbine on its property). Any noise produced by the project must comply with MOE noise guidelines at each and every non-participating receptor, while the noise limits do not apply to participating receptors (i.e., landowners with a turbine on their property). The environmental assessment has been conducted to assess the potential effects from the Project, including potential effects to residents. The EA report is available to all members of the public to review.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
18 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007 (Original letter followed in mail)	The EA identifies Wolfe Island as a level 4 of Important Bird Area, and requiring the highest levels of scrutiny. This was never openly discussed at the open houses, nor was the public informed of the sensitivity and "global and continental significance" of the environmental impact, and the developers plans to mitigate impacts.	Wolfe Island's status as an Important Bird Area ("IBA") was mentioned in the Environmental Overview Report (released March 2006), in responses to individual stakeholder concerns, during discussions at Public Open Houses, and in the Draft EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
19 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	The EA is lacking in specific studies to protect bird habitat, bird migration flyways and protect raptors. There is no cumulative study on all turbines cited for the St. Lawrence Seaway, a major migratory flyway against some 352 turbines slated for Wolfe, Simcoe, Amherst Islands, Cape Vincent and Clayton New York.	A multi-year bird monitoring program has been developed and implemented using guidance from Environment Canada and the Ministry of Natural Resources. Multi-year studies conducted for the project include: habitat surveys, wintering raptors, spring waterfowl, spring raptor and passerine migration, fall waterfowl, fall raptor and passerine migration, breeding birds, and species at risk. Bird surveys have been on-going on Wolfe Island since 2004. Published and unpublished studies of the direct and indirect effects of wind turbines on birds at operating wind power facilities were reviewed and considered in assessing potential effects for the project. Potential effects and their significance vary by species or species group, and are detailed in Technical Appendix C5. Cumulative effects to birds as a result of other potential wind projects in the area were considered in Section 8.3.3.5.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
20 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	The developer was requested to do more in-depth studies by Environment Canada in 2005, 2006, and to provide up to a three year study, and install a test turbine for review. None of these precautionary steps were taken to provide empirical data on bird impacts.	Stantec has been working closely with EC/CWS throughout the course of the project, and EC has approved the workplans for bird studies conducted for the Project. EC/CWS have provided comments on the Draft EA (please see Appendix G8 of the Final EA for their comments).
21 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	Requests to have visual representation of the project was not provided in the time and manner afforded other stakeholders i.e. lease landowners and Municipal Council members were bussed to a turbine site for review. No one set up the same level of information for residents adjacent to turbines i.e. "non-participating receptors".	The bus trip to Fenner wind farm in Madison County, New York, was conducted by Gaia on the 11 January 2003, prior to Canadian Hydro Developers' involvement in the Project. CREC will consider doing something like this in the future if the demand is high or warranted. CREC has committed to participate in the Community Liaison Group and this will be a good forum to discuss this idea.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
22 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	Visual impact display panels were not provided to other "seasonal residents, public and non-receptors" until March of 2007 with no indication of the sheer mass of the cumulative view of all the turbines designed for the St. Lawrence Seaway. Display panels were not to scale and were blurry.	A project layout was required to prepare visual simulations. Visual simulations were presented at the second Public Open House, which we considered an appropriate time to present this information. We did not simulate view of proposed U.S. wind farms since they may or may not be approved. The images on display panels were to scale and were high quality, clear prints.
23 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007	The EA fails to report many bird species such as the Trumpeter Swan, Blue Heron and the impacts to some grassland species ie. snakes, frogs, turtles. Again there is no transboundary bird studies and the impact on international flyways for birds, migration.	Potential effects on reptiles and amphibians and their significance were discussed in Section 7.8 of the Draft EA. Potential effects on birds, including Great Blue Heron, and their significance were discussed in Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9. Cumulative effects to birds as a result of other potential wind projects in the area were considered in Section 8.3.3.5.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
24 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007 (Original letter followed in mail)	The EA fails to provide information regarding provincial ferry transportation and impact to a ferry that is already overloaded with residents, cargo vehicles and tourists. How can this ferry possibly support 225 workers per day, 460-500 tractor trailer loads of equipment/supplies; gravel and cement will also be transported to the Island. What emergency measures are in place to safely, adequately manage oil or hazard contamination spills, fire, or human injury?	Please see response to Comment #7.
25 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007 (Original letter followed in mail)	ERR fails to provide information about waste management	Please see response to Comment #8

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
26 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007 (Original letter followed in mail)	Discussions on the wetlands is also incomplete.	Potential effects on wetlands and their significance were discussed in Section 7.8 of the Draft EA. Additional detail on wetland characteristics were provided in Technical Appendix C7.
27 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007 (Original letter followed in mail)	The EA states that the developer has not done a complete water table assessment, but merely a “field study assessment". Wolfe Island is on top of a large sulphur limestone bed. Any blasting, dredging and digging will have an impact on potable water for Islanders for their livestock and their wells. To not conduct a full impact study is irresponsible. Have we forgotten Walkerton?	The potential effects of the Project on groundwater are addressed in Section 7.4 of the Draft EA. Excavation for foundations or installation of power lines and other infrastructure is a common construction practice for which standard mitigation measures exist. Detailed geotechnical work conducted at the location for each turbine tower will provide information on groundwater depth at each site prior to construction.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
28 Stakeholder #3	Email to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, MInister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Minister of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada cc.Project webmail	27 June 2007 (Original letter followed in mail)	I have read many medical studies that do indicate there are significant impacts to humans, when living near or under turbines. A scientific report on the impacts of windmills and levels of ILFN will be presented at Internoise, 2007, to be held on 28-31 August in Istanbul, Turkey. These results irrefutably demonstrate that wind turbines in the proximity of residential areas produce acoustical environments that can lead to the development of VAD in nearby home-dwellers.	Very little information exists on potential health effects in peer-reviewed, scientific literature, although much information is available in the popular media (e.g., internet). We cannot comment on the results of a paper that has just very recently been presented at a conference, and is not yet published and available for review. Potential health effects resulting from low frequency noise ("LFN") were discussed in Section 7.16 of the Draft EA. As explained in the report, research to date has not shown any biological health effects at levels normally associated with modern operational turbines. Please refer to Section 7.16.2.2 of the Final EA.
Stakeholder #4				
1 Stakeholder #4	Email to: Project webmail J. Gerretsen, MPP T. O'Shea, Township cc. WIRE	14 June 2007	I object to the passage of the Zoning By-law Amendment without prior debate and prior to publication of the EA.	The details related to the passing of the Zoning By-law amendment are under municipal jurisdiction and this amendment is part of the planning process. Disputes regarding the Zoning By-law have been resolved at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing in July 2007.
2 Stakeholder #4	Email to: Project webmail J. Gerretsen, MPP T. O'Shea, Township cc. WIRE	14 June 2007	I object to the inadequate representation of Wolfe Islanders on the Frontenac Islands Council.	Representation of Wolfe Islanders on the Frontenac Islands Council is a political issue and is outside the scope of the EA process.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
3 Stakeholder #4	Email to: Project webmail J. Gerretsen, MPP T. O'Shea, Township cc. WIRE	14 June 2007	I object to ambiguity of the contract for land leases.	The contract for land leases is between lease holders and CREC and is outside the scope of the EA process.
4 Stakeholder #4	Email to: Project webmail J. Gerretsen, MPP T. O'Shea, Township cc. WIRE	14 June 2007	I object to the lack of clarity on key issues from CREC.	Detail regarding which issues you feel are unclear would be helpful and would allow us to better address your concerns.
5 Stakeholder #4	Email to: Project webmail J. Gerretsen, MPP T. O'Shea, Township cc. WIRE	14 June 2007	I object to lack of public discussion on the environmental, health and liability issues that this project raises.	Public consultation for the Project has been ongoing for several years. CREC voluntarily made the Draft EA available for public review and comment. All comments received on the Draft EA have been considered during the preparation of the Final EA. Please see Section 5.0 of the Final EA, which describes in detail the steps taken to involve the public throughout the course of the Project.
6 Stakeholder #4	Email to: Project webmail J. Gerretsen, MPP T. O'Shea, Township cc. WIRE	14 June 2007	I request that council immediately rescind the re-zoning by-law	As noted in Comment #1, disputes regarding the Zoning By-law have been resolved at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing in July 2007.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Stakeholder #5				
1 Stakeholder #5	Project webmail	18 June 2007	Could you please explain the reason for omitting the Loggerhead Shrike from the Bird Report in the Draft EA. The Loggerhead Shrike is an identified endangered species listed in the federal SARA, the provincial SARA and falls under the federal and international Migratory Birds Convention Act. The SARA registry indicates a federal recovery plan in place under the legislation in the greater study area. The Loggerhead Shrike is known to migrate and nest throughout the Kingston and Islands region as well as Eastern Ontario and western Quebec. Just two weeks ago the Ottawa Citizen Bird Report noted the a breeding pair was identified east of Napanee. There is no reference to the Loggershrike in the EA under raptors.	Loggerhead Shrike was not discussed in the Bird Report because there were no records from the Study Area during the Ontario Breeding Bird Atlas (1981-1985 and 2001-2005), in the MNR's Natural Heritage Information Centre database, or in other background information examined during preparation of the EA. In general, core breeding areas in Ontario are known for this species, and the Napanee area is one of them; Wolfe Island is not.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
2 Stakeholder #5	Project webmail	18 June 2007	There is almost no research on the effects of road construction and the importation of materials on nesting and foraging habitat. How many roads will be constructed? What will be the effect of the network of roads and high voltage wires and poles criss-crossing the fields and wetlands areas of the western section of Wolfe Island? Did the researchers map the area sited for access roads for the purpose of locating nesting sites?	Potential effects from general construction activities were not the focus of the Bird Report, but are discussed in the Main Report – please refer to Sections 7.8.2, 7.9.2 and 7.10.2 of the Final EA. Please note that there will be no high voltage transmission lines aboveground on Wolfe Island. The timing of vegetation clearing is dependent on many factors and is unknown at this time. Should clearing be required during the core nesting season, surveys will be undertaken to identify the presence of nesting birds prior to any clearing activities. In the event that nesting birds are identified, they will be protected along with an appropriate species-specific buffer, determined in consultation with EC/CWS.
3 Stakeholder #5	Project webmail	18 June 2007	Your document seems to deal in detail only with potential blade strikes and not with other effects of construction such as road building, increased traffic through bird nesting and foraging areas for the purposes of maintenance and the transport and management of hazardous materials (the Emergency preparedness planning documents in the amenities agreement and the plans in the EA do not sufficiently discuss effects of clean-up and transportation effects on nesting and foraging birds).	Potential effects from general construction activities were not the focus of the Bird Report, but are discussed in the Main Report – please refer to Sections 7.8.2, 7.9.2 and 7.10.2 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
4 Stakeholder #5	Project webmail	18 June 2007	Has your EA been submitted for independent scientific peer review beyond submission to the usual regulatory bodies?	The EA is not prepared by the developer, and is extensively reviewed by regulatory agencies and agencies providing technical expertise. The experts at regulatory agencies have reviewed the Draft EA report, and the Final EA will also be subject to review by expert staff at these agencies (e.g. EC/CWS, MNR, DFO).
5 Stakeholder #5	Project webmail	18 June 2007	What would be the cumulative effect of these developments in the Thousand Islands corridor on migratory birds species identified in the EA and the omitted Loggerhead Shrike.	Cumulative effects were considered in Section 8.0 of the Draft EA. This section considers the cumulative effects between the Wolfe Island Project and proposed U.S. wind power projects. Please refer to Section 8.0 of the Final EA.
6 Stakeholder #5	Project webmail	18 June 2007	Was the Henslow Sparrow omitted from the EA on the basis that it was not identified during the few days of observation? Can you absolutely confirm that the Henslow Sparrow does not migrate through the Thousand Island corridor? This species is registered as endangered under federal, provincial and international law and is close to being extirpated.	Henslow's Sparrow was listed in Table 3.7 and discussed in Section 4.4.2 of Technical Appendix C5, as well as Table 7.3 and Section 7.10.2 of the Draft EA. Additional, targeted surveys for Henslow's Sparrow were conducted in June, 2007 – please refer to Section 3.6.6 of the revised Technical Appendix C5.
7 Stakeholder #5	Project webmail	18 June 2007	The sections dealing with the observed nesting and foraging behaviour of the Great Blue Heron seem contradictory. Early in the report the likelihood of nesting pairs in the study area is dismissed; yet later on in the report a significant number of nesting pairs are identified both along the shore and inland. I think this needs to be reviewed.	Great Blue Herons were observed through the breeding season, but were presumed to be foraging rather than nesting in the study area. Great Blue Herons construct large, conspicuous nests in trees and travel on average 2.3-6.5 km between nesting areas and primary feeding sites. There are no known colonies in the study area.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
8 Stakeholder #5	Project webmail	18 June 2007	In the event that an individual specimen of a federally registered species at risk is destroyed as a result of the construction phase and for operational the life of the project, would the landowner risk prosecution under provincial and federal law, or the company and its subcontractors?	The federal Species at Risk Act prohibits the killing or harassing of extirpated, endangered and threatened species on federal lands. The Wolfe Island portion of the study area is not on federal lands.
9 Stakeholder #5	Project webmail	27 June 2007	The Draft EA states that $390 000 in tax revenue will accrue to the Limestone District Public and Algonquin Lakeshore District Catholic school boards, and that this money will directly benefit elementary school students in the study area. This is a misrepresentation of the funding formula for education in the province of Ontario. School boards do not directly benefit from corporate tax revenue. School boards across the province receive funding on a per pupil basis. Any proposed tax revenue generated by this proposed project will accrue to the province's general revenue fund. The Ministry of Education and the Superintendent of the Algonquin Lakeshore Catholic School Board have confirmed that this statement in the draft ERR is incorrect. Furthermore, this statement misleads parents of students in the study area to expect their children will be provided enhanced services as a result of the project. This is a misrepresentation of the facts and must be corrected.	This statement was made in error, and has been corrected. Appropriate changes have been made to Appendix C13 and throughout the text of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Stakeholder #6				
1 Stakeholder #6	Phone call	20 June 2007	Mapping in EA shows an access road on her property. Road does not exist, and we do not have access to it.	"Access road" is part of the base mapping, just a GIS layer from the MNR, it has nothing to do with the project or proposed project layout. It is not labeled as an access road to WTG 1, it's just that the turbines have been mapped bigger so the turbine numbers can be read. We heard your concerns about access at the Public Open House, and are absolutely clear that we do not have access to your land, and we are not proposing to build anything on your land. You agreed that this is okay, the issue has been resolved.
2 Stakeholder #6	Phone call	20 June 2007	French survey lots are historical and are too narrow to support turbines. These lots were not assessed in the EA.	Explained that regardless of the shape of the lot, the same setbacks would be applied on all properties on the Island.
3 Stakeholder #6	Phone call	20 June 2007	LFN was not dealt with properly in the EA, wants a federal government source saying that it is not a problem (i.e., EC).	The LFN section has been amended since the Draft EA to include more sources. Please see Section 7.16 of the Final EA.
4 Stakeholder #6	Phone call	20 June 2007	TV signals, in particular CKWS, will be lost to the island.	Since release of the Draft EA, an impact assessment on communication systems has been conducted for the project, including potential effects to television signals. This report has been included as Technical Appendix I of the Final EA.
5 Stakeholder #6	Phone call	20 June 2007	The EA did not address the fact that the wind farm will become a major terrorist target.	This scenario is considered extremely unlikely and is not considered in the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
6 Stakeholder #6	Phone call	20 June 2007	The volunteer fire department on the island will not be able to handle it if all the turbines explode.	Turbines are constructed using fire resistant materials. Fire extinguishers are located at the base and top of each tower and regular maintenance activities will also identify any potential fire hazards. CREC will work with the local volunteer fire department develop protocols in case of emergency. Turbine explosions are not a known issue.
7 Stakeholder #6	Phone call	20 June 2007	Was concerned that the military was not on the stakeholder list.	The Canadian Department of National Defence has been added to the stakeholder list.
Stakeholder #7				
1 Stakeholder #7	Project webmail cc. T. O'Shea, Township	25 June 2007	Having trouble reviewing the sound portion of the DRAFT EA - drawings are so small I cannot read their contents. Since this portion is not available at the website, I cannot even enlarge the drawings on my computer. In order for me to complete my review, can you tell me where I can find the larger drawings?	No response necessary (see Comment #2)
2 Stakeholder #7	Project webmail cc. T. O'Shea, Township	25 June 2007	Further to my email, I have now found the sound report on the web and will review.	No response necessary

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
3 Stakeholder #7	Project webmail cc: T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	Overall impression was lots of information and analysis but short on proposed solutions or adjustment of the planned work to take into account perceived problems. The report leads you to a point of a logical conclusion and then simply states that, even though there appears to be an issue, everything if fine. For example, EA talks in length about importance of Big Sandy Bay; however, doesn't suggest rethinking locations of three windmills immediately adjacent to it	Where potential effects have been identified during the EA process, mitigation measures have also been outlined. A major part of any EA is estimating net effects (otherwise known as 'residual effects', and assigning a level of significance to these effects, as outlined in Section 7.0 and 7.1 of the Final EA. This means that the EA is not saying that there will be no effects, but instead makes an assessment on the severity and duration of those net effects. As for the example you provided for potential effects on Big Sandy Bay, please note that although the Draft report mapping shows three turbines 'immediately adjacent' to that wetland, it is because the turbines have been mapped bigger so the turbine numbers can be read. All turbines have minimum setbacks from wetlands, and the setback from a PSW such as Big Sandy Bay is 120 m from the closest point on the turbine base.
4 Stakeholder #7	Project webmail cc: T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	In spite of all the reassurances concerning property values not declining for properties in the immediate area of windmills, I still feel that the value of my property will be decrease and I want to know what will be done to compensate me if it does.	As discussed in Section 7.14.2.2 and Technical Appendix C16 of the Draft EA, a decline in property values is not anticipated as a result of the Project. Therefore, CREC has no plans for compensation in this regard.
5 Stakeholder #7	Project webmail cc: T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	I still feel that people that own building lots with no dwelling on them should be treated as though there was a building. I see in the correspondence file that if a lot owner in this category wrote and asked to have that consideration, the company agreed to it. Why not make it universal?	As part of siting activities, CREC implemented a turbine setback of 400 m from existing vacant lot lines for lots 4 ha in size or smaller.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
6 Stakeholder #7	Project webmail cc: T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	This is the first time that I have seen noise ratings for the turbines and I see that they have a rating of 103 db. In all the public meetings I asked for this information but no one including Mr. Keating would share that with me.	The information is now available to the public.
7 Stakeholder #7	Project webmail cc: T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	Appears from computer modeling that a residence on the outside of the study area, at 700m, from the nearest turbine, is subject to almost the same level of noise as a residence 700 m from three turbines. There is a difference of approximately 2 decibels. This doesn't make sense, there is some factor of increase when you are close to three sources as compared to one.	Regardless of the technical factors involved in the noise modelling, the MOE guidelines for environmental noise emissions will be adhered to at all residences. This means that the guideline will be met at a residence regardless of whether the noise emission is a result of one turbine or several turbines; the combined effect will meet MOE guidelines.
8 Stakeholder #7	Project webmail cc: T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	Although all the readings are close to the threshold limit, no follow up monitoring had been recommended. This leaves it to anyone affected by what they feel is excessive sound levels to instigate follow-up monitoring when I feel it should be a matter of due course and not something to be thought of later.	The Final EA has a section specifically dedicated to describing the protocol to follow for residents with complaints during construction and operation of the Project (please see Section 9.4.1.8 and 9.4.2.3).
9 Stakeholder #7	Project webmail cc: T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	EA states that a waste management plan must be developed to deal with construction waste but nowhere does it state that our waste site on the island is rapidly filling and that all waste from construction and ongoing maintenance activities should be removed from the island. If this doesn't happen, the funds generated by the amenities agreement will all go to taking care of the dump issue.	Section 7.19 of the Final EA has been updated to provide more detailed information on the disposal of waste during construction and operation. The Island landfill will only be used for the permitted waste in which it accepts, which does not include construction material. Effects to the landfill during operation are expected to be negligible.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
10 Stakeholder #7	Project webmail cc: T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	Regarding the effect of wind farms on birds and butterflies, the assessment really comes to a conclusion that we're going to lose a few but not enough to worry about and species that are not really threatened. I hope they are right because it would be a shame to not see the snowy owls, other raptors and monarch butterflies that regularly make their way to the island.	The projected effects will be the subject of a thorough post-construction monitoring program, to be developed in collaboration with EC/CWS and MNR. Any unanticipated effects will be addressed through the "adaptive management" portion of the post-construction monitoring agreement.
11 Stakeholder #7	Project webmail cc: T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	The ferry traffic and expected pattern of use is analyzed in great detail although the base assumptions could be questioned. For example there will definitely be a peak period of use and that is considered; however tracks and material flow to a site regularly throughout the day and I'm not sure that is well recognized in the analysis.	Analysis deals with the transportation of workers to and from the Island during the construction phase. We are unclear about what "tracks and material flowing to a site regularly throughout the day" means, or what effect this has on use of the Wolfe Island ferry. Please note that, as stated in the Draft EA (Section 7.15.3), CREC has been continuing to examine various options for the transportation of Project components and workers to and from the Island. More detail on traffic management is now available, and is provided in Section 7.15, Technical Appendix C15, and Technical Appendix I of the Final EA.
12 Stakeholder #7	Project webmail cc: T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	Attached original letter which refers to "initial environmental assessment"	The original letter, which was sent 27 April 2007, refers to information provided in the Environmental Overview Report (released March 2006). The letter from Stantec dated June 6, 2007 clarified this point.
Stakeholder #8				
1 Stakeholder #8	Project webmail	27 June 2007	What will be put in place to make certain WI structures will be removed if they become outmoded in the future, even if CREC goes out of business?	There will always be significant residual value in the materials and it will be economical to remove outdated equipment and machinery and possibly even repower in the future with modern machines in 25 to 30 years.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
2 Stakeholder #8	Project webmail	27 June 2007	It should be public knowledge as to the subsidy being granted to the project since the taxpayer needs to know what these structures are really costing. Without Provincial and Federal assistance, these projects would not be economically feasible	The Government of Canada, through various initiatives over time, has outlined for Canadians an evolving policy framework for honouring our international environmental commitments and for fostering the development of renewable energy sources such as wind within Canada. The Canadian government has initiated these activities as a matter of good public policy that serves to better the environment and enhance the lives of Canadians. This includes the new federal ecoENERGY for Renewable Power program, which will provide an incentive of one cent per kilowatt-hour for up to 10 years to eligible low-impact, renewable electricity projects such as the Wolfe Island Wind Project, once operational. However, the financial burden for construction of the wind plant belongs entirely to CREC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Canadian Hydro Developers and all associated economic risks are the sole responsibility of CREC.
Stakeholder #9				
1 Stakeholder #9	Project webmail	28 June 2007	Draft EA has no substantive discussion of reasons for setback decisions already made.	Setbacks outlined in the Zoning By-law are prescribed by the local municipality, and are used as absolute minimums during the siting process. Actual setbacks are often larger than these minimums, and include incorporating noise guideline requirements set out by the MOE. The appropriateness of the Project setbacks was determined as part of the planning process, and an Ontario Municipal Board hearing was held in July 2007 on the topic. Please refer to Section 2.5.5.2 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
2 Stakeholder #9	Project webmail	28 June 2007	Concerns surrounding noise and related health issues were dismissed without reference to similar problems which have been identified at currently operating wind plants.	Very little information exists on potential health effects from wind plants in peer-reviewed, scientific literature, although much information is available in the popular media (e.g., internet). Since release of the Draft EA, Stantec has completed literature search of published, peer-reviewed scientific literature to determine if there is scientific evidence that modern wind plants cause some of the potential health effects often cited in the popular media. Please see Section 7.16 of the Final EA. Potential health effects related to noise (e.g., from infrasound and low frequency noise) were discussed in Section 7.16 of the Draft EA. As explained in the report, research to date has not shown any biological health effects at levels normally associated with modern operational turbines. Please refer to Section 7.16.2.2 of the Final EA.
3 Stakeholder #9	Project webmail	28 June 2007	Remain concerned about setbacks to “non-participating receptors”, schools, and environmentally sensitive areas (e.g. Big Sandy Bay)	The minimum setbacks to these receptors, as provided in the Zoning By-law, have been amended as a result of the Ontario Municipal Board hearing in July 2007. However, please note that Zoning By-law setbacks represented the absolute minimum setbacks used during the siting process. Please refer to Section 2.5.5.2 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Stakeholder #10				
1 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	CHD claims reason for DRAFT ERR is due to high level of community interest; however, it is actually for the public to correct their errors.	Part of the consultation process is giving interested people an opportunity to review relevant project documents, including the opportunity to correct errors. However, the main objectives of releasing the Draft EA for public review were to assess how well concerns had been addressed, bring any additional concerns to light, and to resolve issues before we completed the Final EA.
2 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	CHD recently purchased submarine cable, final report still hasn't been released, so CHD must know something the rest of the public doesn't.	The submarine cable was required to be purchased in advance to meet the current construction schedule. Purchase of the cable is a financial risk that belongs wholly to CREC and in no way guarantees approval of the Project.
3 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	Section 1.6: disagree that "the community has demonstrated support of the wind plant". Participating landowners constitute small percentage of population of WI.	While we continue to believe the wind plant is supported by the majority of Wolfe Island residents, the sentence does not materially affect this section of the report and has been removed.
4 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	Section 1.8: Schedule shows that EA process, and Notice of Completion would occur before Official Plans and Zoning By-law amendments – not the case	The Project schedule has been updated in the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	Section 1.12.1: ERR indicates that due to balancing issues for IESO, secondary source of energy is needed while wind is not blowing, can be mitigated if turbines are geographically disbursed. However, 197 MW of power constitutes 15% of province's planned renewable energy, and it is in one place	The Independent Electricity System Operator ("IESO") for Ontario is responsible for balancing the demand for, and supply of, industrial and residential electricity. A System Impact Assessment (SIA) has been completed by CREC for the IESO, which determines the effect of the Project on the reliability and capacity of the provincial transmission system. The SIA has been completed for the Project, and the IESO has no concern regarding the Project.
6 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	Section 2.4: section indicates that WI is agricultural. The fact that there are 256 non-participating receptors within 1km of a turbine shows this is not true. Increasing shift to residential, and a large part of the population is seasonal.	Final EA has been amended to mention the large number of seasonal residences. However, the Draft EA does mention that there are higher density residential areas on the Island. The Island is still currently dominated by agricultural and rural land-uses.
7 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	Section 2.7.1; project does not promote equity between participating and non-participating landowners due to money participating landowners receives (while non-participating receives nothing, and has to endure 'negative impacts'), and that turbine distance from participating land-owners home is greater than distance from non-participating landowners	An Amenities Agreement was made with the Township to provide additional benefits to non-participating landowners. Please note that in terms of setbacks from homes, these distances are based on MOE noise guidelines and other constraints, which do not apply to participating landowners.
8 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	The economic injections will improve the quality of life for some, but those who moved to the island to escape urbanization and industrialization and the noise associated with it will suffer a tremendous decrease in quality of life.	Wind plants will help maintain the rural nature of the Island by providing additional income to farmers, thereby allowing land to remain in agricultural production. The Project will operate in compliance with MOE noise guidelines.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
9 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	Section 3.2 CREC voluntarily elevated the project to an Environmental Review and because of this the Screening Report was not completed. Although in theory this seems to show foresight and a willingness to ensure completeness, this meant that there was a lack of concrete information about this project for the community to view. Such things as the visual effect of the turbines and the noise assessment were not released before the Amenities Agreement with the Township was signed. If the Screening Report had been released, the public could deal with facts rather than speculation.	More information is available to the community through the release of an ERR instead of an ESR. An ERR requires considerable additional study.
10 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	Section 5.4 Many islanders and seasonal residents did not receive mass mailings?	Canada Post's Unaddressed Admail program was used for mass mailings to every registered address on Wolfe and Simcoe Islands. Some seasonal residents may not have received mailings if they do not maintain a postal address on Wolfe Island.
11 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	Ferry boards were only used to inform residents that DRAFT ERR was available.	Based on stakeholder feedback, the Ferry boards were utilized to advertise the Notice of Completion and the beginning of the formal 30 Notice of Completion review and comment period.
12 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	Fact that only 36 people attended July 2004 POH shows inadequate advertising.	Public Open Houses have been well attended, and notification efforts for the March 2006 and March 2007 Public Open Houses was extensive.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
13 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	At least one of the POHs were for landowners, separate from public, was different information presented to them than to the rest of the public?	Landowner Open Houses discussed details of the Land Lease Agreements.
14 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	Section 5.1., Table 5.2: Bell Mobility indicated the Wolfe Island Project will not interfere with any of Bell's MW systems in the area. Was Telus contacted? Telus is used by many of the island residents.	Bell Mobility was contacted because it is the private sector partner of the Government Mobile Communications Office. Bell Mobility is contracted to manage and operate Ontario Government mobile communications needs for public safety, including ambulance services and Ontario Provincial Police services.
15 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	Section 7.7: Does not understand how "worst case wind direction of 30deg ie wind from the northeast" can apply to all residents. Doesn't worst case scenario for noise depend on direction of turbine from dwelling? WHO has indicated that 30dbA is as loud as it should be for sleeping, yet MOE has 40dbA as its guidelines.	The project must meet the requirements of the MOE noise guidelines, which has been completed for the Project. The MOE is also responsible for providing guidelines such as 40 dBA for rural areas. Note that the 40 dBA guideline is for the outside of the receptor (i.e., residence); that sound levels are not modelled for inside the residence.
16 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	Section 7.8.3.1: EA indicates efforts are made to set turbines away from woodlots. Although a base of a turbine may be located 50 m away from a woodlot, when taking the blades into consideration, they are only 5m away.	Municipal setbacks, as established under the Zoning By-law approved as part of the Ontario Municipal Board hearing, are measured from the closest edge of the tower. Please note that the blades will not remain a stationary distance from features; the yaw enables the nacelle to move around to face the wind. Therefore, measuring setbacks from the blade tip would be misleading, as the separation distance would vary according to wind direction.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
17 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	Section 7.9.1.1: After voicing concerns to Stantec regarding bird mortality, their response was that more birds are killed by man-made structures such as buildings and windows. Is the justification that if millions are already being killed, what a couple hundred more? WI is an IBA, report states some of these species at risk will be killed, how then can the report conclude that the adverse effects will be minimized?	Bird mortality at wind facilities varies according to the species or species group. Sections 7.9 (addressing birds) and 7.10 (addressing species at risk) outline some methods by which the adverse effects will be minimized, but acknowledge that there will be some net effects. Sections 7.9 and 7.10 rated the significance of net effects as low (for birds) and moderate (for species at risk). Please refer to these sections of the Final EA for a discussion of the reasons for the ratings.
18 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	Section 7.12.2.2.: Report states that shadow flicker can be reduced if sun isn't too bright, or with household blinds, and vegetation. Section 7.18.1 says there are limited forests on WI, so it will be up to the residents to deal with the problem themselves. Although CREC is causing the problem they have no intention of mitigating it. Thus it is false to say the Shadow Flicker can be reduced from the 37 hours per year per household; in other words 8584 dwelling-hours per year.	Shadow flicker is not anticipated to be a significant effect. 37 hours is a worst case scenario and will likely be reduced by natural features such as clouds and wind direction by up to 82%. Since the Draft EA, Section 7.12 and Technical Appendix C15 have been updated to provide more detailed information on shadow flicker.
19 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	Figure 2.2. #41 is labeled as an elementary school, this is however a farmer's field. Also, the ferry doesn't dock at end of Hwy 95.	Thank you for the correction, the location of the elementary school has been corrected in the Final EA. With regards to the location of the ferry dock, the scale of the map makes it appear as though the ferry docks at Highway 95.
20 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	28 June 2007	An independent study is necessary that does not minimize everything and takes into consideration all the residents, not just the landowners who are receiving compensation.	The EA is not prepared by the developer, and is extensively reviewed by regulatory agencies and agencies providing technical expertise. The experts at regulatory agencies have reviewed the Draft EA report, and the Final EA will also be subject to review by expert staff at these agencies (e.g. EC/CWS, MNR, DFO).

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
21 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail cc. L. Broten, Minister of the Environment	17 August 2007	Didn't see anything in Draft EA addressing noise traveling through bedrock	Ground borne vibration from wind farms is well below the human threshold of perception for vibration. The human threshold is typically 1 mm/sec rms @ 1.3 Hz decreasing to 0.1mm/sec rms @ 8 Hz and remains 0.1 mm/sec rms for increasing frequency (i.e. we are less sensitive and the threshold is therefore higher). The literature outlines that the vibration (8 Hz and upwards) is approximately 1/5th to 1/10th of human perception in the nearfield (within 25m) of the turbine. In the frequency range below 8 Hz, the measured vibration is actually more like 1/10th to 1/100th of the human threshold. Furthermore, the vibration magnitudes will drop off significantly at greater distances from the turbine. Ground borne vibration is therefore not expected to be a concern.
22 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail cc. L. Broten, Minister of the Environment	17 August 2007	Noise assessment only addresses noise traveling through air, but this is only one medium When you get a 125m structure made of steel and fastened to bedrock, there is going to be noise transference	See Comment #21
23 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail cc. L. Broten, Minister of the Environment	17 August 2007	Many homes on WI are built on bedrock, including ours, this could be an issue. Could also explain why in other projects, some residents are more severely affected by noise from turbines than others. If one home is built on bedrock, but home next to it is on soil, it is possible that home on bedrock would be affected by noise of turbines but one built on soil wouldn't be.	See Comment #21

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
24 Stakeholder #10	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail cc. L. Broten, Minister of the Environment	17 August 2007	Are there any studies done that address amount of noise transferred to bedrock from a wind turbines and how far noise of different frequencies travels through bedrock?	See Comment #21
Stakeholder #11				
1 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	Failure by developer's forces to relay Open House information to WI taxpayers/property owners who do / did not happen to reside on the Island.	A description of how residents have been notified for various ESP-related activities is located in Section 5.0 of the Draft EA and Section 5.0 of the Final EA. This included direct mailings to every stakeholder that had expressed an interest in the project throughout the several years of Project consultation. In response to stakeholder feedback, the Township of Frontenac Islands Council has endorsed a resolution that allows CREC access to the mailing list for all MPAC registered property owners in the Township. This has allowed for a mailout of the notification of release of the Final EA to all landowners, including those that do not live on the Island.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
2 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	Admail envelopes were not personalized, it is possible that many communications were thrown out before being read, and tenants did not pass information on to landlords.	The name of the project and reason for the mailout was placed in capital letters on the front of each envelope.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
3 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	Advised by several people who attended the Public Open House that the representatives of the developer were not well informed, unable to answer many questions, nor were questions encouraged	The Public Open Houses were designed for the purpose of having many study team representatives available to answer any questions the public brought forth. Members of the study team represented a spectrum of specialties to ensure that questions could be effectively addressed by the appropriate team member. As has been the case throughout the EA process, questions were encouraged during the Open Houses. In fact, the entire format of the Public Open Houses were specifically designed so that the maximum amount of questions and information could be shared in the allotted time.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
4 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	Although Stantec made us aware that the EA would be forthcoming, it was word of mouth that provided us with the actual availability date of the EA and the related deadline for comments.	Release of the Draft EA for public review and comment was voluntary and public notification included newspaper notices and posting on the project's website (please see Section 5.7 and Appendix G7 of the Final EA for a full description of public notification for the release of the Draft EA). The formal 30 day Notice of Completion review and comment period was advertised using many methods, including newspaper notices and direct mailouts to the project mailing list (please see Section 5.8 and Appendix G8 of the Final EA for a full description of public notification for the Notice of Completion).

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	Previously published material indicated turbines would be on the west side of the Island, which indicated to many that they would be located on the western peninsula.	The description of the Project study area has stated that turbines would be sited 'throughout the western portion of the Island'. This was meant to indicate the portion of the Island west of the Canal division, and a project study area map usually accompanied this text. This was an unfortunate misunderstanding, and CREC never tried to imply that all 86 turbines would be sited at the end of one peninsula.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
6 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	Effect of development will be detrimental to WI and Kingston, in terms of changing basic quiet and unspoiled nature of the Island and changing views from Kingston to WI	Environmental noise from the turbines will comply with MOE guidelines, as discussed in Section 7.7and Technical Appendix C4 of the Draft EA. The Draft EA provided an assessment of potential effects to community character (please see Section 7.12 of the Final EA), and viewscape (please see Section 7.18, and Technical Appendix C11 of the Final EA).

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
7 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	Noise and lighting would change nature and calming effect of Island. If the windfarm were less extensive, with smaller turbines, potential effects would not be so worrying	The Draft EA discussed potential effects to community character (see Section 7.12), potential effects from environmental noise (see Section 7.7), and provided a section that specifically discussed turbine lighting (see Section 7.12.2.2).

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
8 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	After visiting a wind farm in Melancthon Township, developed by CREC, we are not confident that even the MOE guidelines for acceptable noise levels is sufficient. These machines were noisy and other Wolfe Island property owners who visited a wind farm in New York state also found the machines to be noisy and unsightly.	The Project will meet the required provincial noise guidelines. The acceptability of these guidelines is a concern better directed to the MOE, as CREC is unable to comment for the MOE.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
9 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	ADEQUATE SETBACKS ARE ESSENTIAL!!!!	CREC is in full agreement.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
10 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	Property value comparison to Melancthon is not relative since Melancthon is bordered by major roads, there are no waterfront/beach properties, visible wetlands, pretty village or as pleasing rural views as there are on WI.	The property value section in the Draft EA reviewed available literature on effects to property value from wind plants worldwide (see Section 7.14.2.2 of the Draft EA and Final EA). The literature from the Melancthon wind plant was used as part of this review because very little Ontario data is available. In recognition of the differences in the two study areas, CREC has commissioned a property value study for Wolfe Island, which was provided as Technical Appendix C16 of the Draft EA and Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
11 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	Not familiar with the other referenced locations in property value section, but again, these may not be a fair comparison to WI which offers a quiet, retreat-like lifestyle.	We can only use data available from operating wind plants. Every location is different. CREC has commissioned a property value study on Wolfe Island for this reason.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
12 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	During own research, found some studies that reflected a negative impact on property values, these were not referenced in the EA.	A literature search was conducted to assess the potential effects to property value from the construction and operation of a wind plant. The general consensus in the vast majority of the literature is that wind plants do not materially affect local property values. In addition, CREC has commissioned a property value study specific to Wolfe Island (Technical Appendix C16 of the Draft EA).

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
13 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	EA – tourism section says "New opportunities for tours, retail opportunities for related souvenirs and opportunity to develop new interpretive signage" - this is a stretch.	These comments are based on the experience of comparable wind plant operations in eight Canadian and U.S. jurisdictions, as well as input by local and regional tourism stakeholders and European experiences (see Technical Appendix C12).

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
14 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	EA says there will be initial increase in tourism for a period of time after construction. What is this period of time? A week, month??	The EA states that an initial influx of visitors to Wolfe Island is a likely outcome, however CREC is unable to guarantee the duration of the interest in the wind plant by tourists – each wind plant is unique, as each location is different.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
15 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	WI is currently popular with cottagers, bicyclists, bird-watchers, golfers, hunters, and more people are discovering Big Sandy Bay provincial park and the pretty and quiet B&B's. Common sense dictates that 'industrialization' of the Island would not be appealing to these types of visitors	Potential effects to tourism have been assessed as part of the Draft EA. Please refer to Section 7.13 and Technical Appendix C12 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
16 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	We are also very concerned about the wildlife on the Island. We were waiting for the EA before making any comments on that, but we are now running out of time and it seems that we should leave these issues to those more qualified to evaluate the related research. However, it seems unlikely that masses of migrating birds, in addition to various 4-legged animals which already have little natural cover and a relatively small area to traverse, would be affected "minimally".	A thorough assessment has been made of potential effects to wildlife, including migrating birds and mammals. The sections have been reviewed and commented on by several regulating agencies, including Environment Canada and the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
17 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	We have heard rumours regarding a possible Phase 2 of the project (i.e. beyond the 86 currently proposed turbines) but have found no evidence of this. Please advise, conclusively, whether a Phase 2 is anticipated.	There are no plans for a second phase of the Project.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
18 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	If property values decline due to the proposed development and its affects on the Island, will the developer compensate those affected?	Property values on Wolfe Island are not anticipated to be affected as a result of the Project. CREC therefore has no plans for compensation in this regard.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
19 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	What will happen if the developer fails to adhere to the guidelines outlined in the EA in reference to mitigation, controls, etc. or if things go horribly wrong? What recourse is available to affected individuals/businesses and other entities?	CREC is legally required to adhere to the mitigation measures put forth in the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
20 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	Nothing can fully compensate those who may have to walk away from the homes/properties they love on and on which they based their future plans and/or hopes for their children and grandchildren.	CREC is unable to respond to this comment.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
21 Stakeholder #11	Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Gerretsen, MPP P. Milliken, MP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources WIRE T. O'Shea, Township	29 June 2007	There is extensive evidence to support the fact that wind energy still has a long way to go and is not cost-effective, nor is it as 'green' and 'pure' as widely promoted by developers and repeated by innocents who have not looked beyond the surface of propaganda. If this is the case, then why consider desecrating a very precious area which is enjoyed by many living beings?	Wind energy is a competitive business today, with the policy support of both the federal and provincial governments. Wind energy is also cost competitive with all other forms of new generation. Also, wind is free, while many other fuel sources are not, and once a wind plant is up and running it provides approximately 20-years of fixed stable pricing.
Stakeholder #12				
1 Stakeholder #12	Email from Nancy Steele to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Many residents did not receive written information by mail	Canada Post's Unaddressed Admail program was used for mass mailings to every registered address on Wolfe and Simcoe Islands. Some seasonal residents may not have received mailings if they do not maintain a postal address on Wolfe Island. A full description of the many ways stakeholders were notified throughout the course of the Project is located in Section 5.0 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
2 Stakeholder #12	Email from Nancy Steele to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Seasonal residents were never informed by mail of plans to open WI to turbines.	In response to stakeholder feedback, the Township of Frontenac Islands Council has endorsed a resolution that allows CREC access to the mailing list for all MPAC registered property owners in the Township. This has allowed for a mailout of the notification of release of the Final EA to all landowners, including those that do not live on the Island.
3 Stakeholder #12	Email from Nancy Steele to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Vote made by previous council to current one, as I understand it, as their last council meeting, voted to change the bylaws to permit wind generators on rural land, this important decision should have been left to the incoming council after more public input.	Planning and political decisions are under the jurisdiction of the Township of Frontenac Islands and its Council and are outside the scope of this EA.
4 Stakeholder #12	Email from Nancy Steele to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Practical implications not thought through: use of the dump for dumping of CREC waste	Section 7.19 of the Final EA has been updated to provide more detailed information on the disposal of waste during construction and operation. The Island landfill will only be used for the permitted waste in which it accepts, which does not include construction material. Effects to the landfill during operation are expected to be negligible.
5 Stakeholder #12	Email from Nancy Steele to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Practical implications not thought through: use of ferry, already overcrowded to transport workers and some 400 large trucks with loads of material	As stated in the Draft EA (Section 7.15.3), CREC has been continuing to examine various options for the transportation of Project components and workers to and from the Island. More detail on traffic management is now available, and is provided in Section 7.15, Technical Appendix C15, and Technical Appendix I of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
6 Stakeholder #12	Email from Nancy Steele to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Many of the conclusions on bird population did not take into consideration that Wolfe Island has a level 4 designation for migratory bird significance	Stantec's field surveys and bird report were designed to take into account Wolfe Island's status as an IBA, and survey workplans were developed with input from Environment Canada / Canadian Wildlife Service.
7 Stakeholder #12	Email from Nancy Steele to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Setback of turbines to permanent residential property is too short given the many European countries with extended experience are increasing distances from residences to a minimum of 1.5 km.	Minimum setback distances from residences are determined by the municipality. However, additional constraints, such as those imposed by the requirement to meet MOE noise guidelines, are also included as part of the turbine siting process. CREC will comply with all provincial and federal requirements for turbine siting.
8 Stakeholder #12	Email from Nancy Steele to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Health and safety issues not fully addressed in EA	Potential and perceived health effects as a result of the Project were discussed in Section 7.16 of the Draft EA. While we appreciate your comment, specific details regarding where the perceived shortcoming in the Draft report section would help us respond to your concerns in a more appropriate manner. Based on stakeholder feedback, this section of the Final EA has been updated to provide more detailed information on some additional potential and perceived health effects. Please refer to Section 7.16 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Stakeholder #13				
1 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	I am concerned that through the current process we are rapidly moving towards giving the proponents of the wind plant permission to start the construction of the initial phase of the plant without giving proper consideration to the short and long term effects and without having a fully bumped up environmental screening report.	CREC cannot start construction until the federal and provincial environmental assessment processes have been completed. Please note following the EA processes, there are also over 90 separate permits and approvals will need to be obtained. The EA report has been prepared as a provincial Environmental Review Report – the highest level of detail under the provincial Environmental Screening Process for electricity projects. The public has an opportunity to provide comments during the formal 30-day Notice of Completion review and comment period, and also submit Requests to Elevate to the MOE.
2 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	EA does not adequately address concerns about health and well being of the Island residents, its wildlife, bird populations, habitats and patterns and global and international issues that would be the result of bottlenecking large numbers of turbines on the US and Canadian sides of the mouth of the St. Lawrence	We appreciate your comment; however specific details regarding what you feel was not adequately addressed in the EA would help us to better respond to your concerns. The EA is quite specific and detailed in terms of potential effects and mitigation measures. The issues that you mention have been addressed within the Draft EA: Section 7.16 (Public Health and Safety), Section 7.18 (Terrestrial and Wetland Flora and Fauna), Section 7.9 (Migratory Birds and Other Avian Species), Section 8.0 (Cumulative Effects).
3 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Do not believe Municipal council and past and present councilors and the mayor have properly represented the interests of the Island residents.	We cannot address this comment since it is a political issue and is outside the scope of the EA process.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
4 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Rezoning bylaws were passed before going through proper environmental screening	The details related to the passing of the Zoning By-law amendment are under municipal jurisdiction and this amendment is part of the planning process. Disputes regarding the Zoning By-law have been resolved at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing in July 2007.
5 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Island councilors were in conflict of interest and were not able to vote at time of voting and public was not given adequate time or information to understand magnitude of the decisions or to have input before the voting took place.	We cannot address this comment since it is a political issue and is outside the scope of the EA process.
6 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Amenities agreement signed in June/06 and made public May/07 does not represent the needs of the community: monies to come to the community will be divided with Howe Island – councilors from Howe Island held the majority of the votes.	Allocation of funds received as a result of the Amenities Agreement is up to the Township and Council to determine.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
7 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Amenities Agreement clearly outlines how the monies are to be used in the reconstruction of the destroyed areas and the courts cases that are a result of the Project. The ERR states that the amenities will be used for community enhancement. Conflicting information.	The cost to repair any damaged municipal works (e.g., roads, structures, services, facilities) as a result of Project construction are in addition to the payment of the Amenities Fee. Generally, as a result of constructing the wind plant , many Wolfe Island roads will be improved prior to and during construction to accommodate the increased loadings imposed by transporting turbines and other components. When construction is complete, these improved roads will be another benefit t the community. Allocation of funds received as a result of the Amenities Agreement is up to the Township and Council to determine. The details of the Amenities Agreement are between the Township and CREC, and is outside the scope of the EA process. However, the EA has been amended to say that monies received by the Township from the Amenities Agreement could be used for community enhancement.
8 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	EA does not adequately address the Island's social and economic wellbeing, health and safety of the residents, global and international impact that will result of invasion of turbines on bird and animal habitat and migratory patterns	Please refer to Comment #2.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
9 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Most islanders work off island in professional careers at RMC, Queen's, CSC and the health industry. The islanders who are able to stay on the island work out of their homes and are highly skilled boat builders, fine carpenters, artisans, musicians and film makers. The island is rich in arts and culture and this is not reflected in the Draft EA.	EA has been amended to state in Section 7.12.1.1 that there are many recreational and cultural opportunities on the Wolfe Island for both resident Islanders and tourists. These various attributes of Wolfe Island all contribute to the Island's identity.
10 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	The Draft EA states that there will be a neutral or positive change to the visual environment - does not adequately reflect loss of business, peace of mind, and quality of life changes that will be a direct result of the visual changes to the Island. There will be no view on this Island that will not be affected by the turbines.	The significance of Project effects to the viewscape has been rated Medium in the Draft EA, as positive or negative depending on the user's subjective opinion. Please refer to Section 7.18 and Technical Appendix C11 of the Final EA for discussions on potential effects to the local viewscape.
11 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	How can a study state that property values will not be adversely affected by the proponent's industrial plant? Property values of any residence situated near an industrial plant of this magnitude anywhere in the world would be affected. Our property values will be affected by the wind plant.	As discussed in Section 7.14.2 of the Draft EA report, studies worldwide indicate that wind power projects do not materially affect property values. In addition, CREC has commissioned a property value study specific to Wolfe Island (Technical Appendix C16 of the Draft EA).
12 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Increase in noise level has not been adequately addressed: it will be a feature in Islander's daily lives anywhere on the Island. Noise level will also affect mainlanders on both sides of the border. Transformers, electrical lines, generating stations, turbines are not quiet.	Please refer to Section 7.7 of the Draft EA, and Technical Appendix C4. An Environmental Noise Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the Project. The Project will comply with MOE noise guidelines for Rural Areas.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
13 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	There are studies from other countries that question the sacrifice for wind energy generated on land or near water – these studies not reflected in Draft EA	It is not possible for us to take into account all studies regarding wind power around the world. Additionally, we must evaluate all our references for reliability. It is important to note that there are many different models of wind turbine in operation around the world, with varying levels of environmental noise emitted by different plants. The EA report addresses advantages, disadvantages, and alternatives to the project (please refer to Section 1.12 of the Final EA).
14 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Stantec uses data collected at mainland sites – no differentiation between an Island plant and a mainland plant – does not adequately address the issues of the island.	We endeavored to identify and address in the EA all issues that make the project unique due to it's island location (police and other emergency services, transportation for workers, submarine cable, etc).
15 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	The Island is not big, yet the proponent wants 86 turbines now, and there is a possibility of a second stage (Note: Amenities Agreement)	There are no plans for a second phase of the Project.
16 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	EA does not include land affected by the moving of the turbines into place.	The Draft EA discusses how Project components will be moved to each site (see Section 2.5.5.3, 2.5.5.4). Also, every feature assessed as part of the Draft EA (see Section 7.0) had sections dedicated to the construction phase of the Project, and the potential effects to all features during this phase.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
17 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	EA does not include land affected by the moving arms, the power lines, generating station, and individual transformers.	Power lines, the transformer station, pad mounted transformers are described in detail in Section 2.0 of the EA Report. Effects of these project components on the natural and socio-economic environment are assessed in Section 7.0 of the EA report.
18 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	EA does not include land affected by waterfront usage for cables	The Draft EA assessed the effects to land by waterfront usage for the submarine transmission cable. A detailed assessment of the submarine cable crossing, including landfall locations, can be found in Technical Appendix C10 of the EA report. Since the cable will be buried, there will be no effects during the operations phase.
19 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada		EA does not mention proposed cable to run to the States.	There is not, and never has been, a submarine cable to the United States proposed as part of the Project.
20 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada		No mention of loss of municipal lands for recreation use.	No municipal lands will be lost for recreational use. Please refer to Section 7.13 for discussion on the potential effects to recreation.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
21 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	WI is a level 4 designated migratory bird area. Loss and destruction of land will mean a loss of habitat and disruption in the bird population's migratory habitats. This will have global and international significance. Bird kill is only one part of the bird population destruction and interruption. Fact that we are an important bird area should demand WI undergoes strictest of environmental screenings. Company plans to monitor bird kills – this is not enough. Monitoring after the fact is wrong.	The level of concern category, potential effects including indirect effects such as habitat loss, fragmentation and disturbance, and significance of project effects are discussed in Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA. The proposed monitoring program includes monitoring of indirect effects as well as direct mortality. The EA report has been prepared as a provincial Environmental Review Report – the highest level of detail under the provincial Environmental Screening Process for electricity projects.
22 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	EA does not do adequate justice to the bats and butterfly populations.	A review of available literature indicates that risk to butterflies is very limited (Technical Appendix C8). In response to concerns about bats, CREC commissioned a radar-acoustic study of bats and nocturnally migrating birds in fall 2007 to supplement baseline data. Results will be provided under separate cover.
23 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Setbacks are not far enough away from human and animal receptors, from wetland and environmentally protected areas. For health and safety, many studies are suggesting a minimum of 1.5km.	Setbacks are established in many different ways, and CREC will comply with all federal and provincial requirements for turbine siting. Health effects have also been assessed in Section 7.16. A field survey was completed to examine potential effects from the Project on natural features in selected areas of the Island where a natural feature was relatively close to the minimum setback. This survey and its results are discussed in the main report Section 7.3, 7.8, 7.10 and Technical Appendix C7 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
24 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Discrepancies in the setbacks stated in the Amenities Agreement and the Draft EA.	The Amenities Agreement does not discuss setbacks, but we assume you are referring to the seeming discrepancy between setbacks listed in the EA and those listed in the Zoning By-law Amendement. The setbacks provided in the Final EA are those that were actually used in the turbine siting process, while Zoning By-law setbacks determined by the municipality represent the absolute minimum setbacks used in the siting process.
25 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Several landowners do not live on the land they are leasing, several are occasional residents living km away from the optioned areas – these facts not reflected in the demographics of the land leasing areas.	The land-lease agreement is with landowners for property that they own.
26 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Often sites are placed at back of landowner's properties, but close to non-participating residences.	Turbine siting adheres to all setbacks, including to non-participating residences and noise requirements of the MOE. Turbines may be potentially be closer to a neighbour's house, but are still far enough away to adhere to these setbacks and MOE environmental noise guidelines.
27 Stakeholder #13	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Stakeholders and the public have not been properly informed or allowed input.	Please see Section 5.0 of the EA for a detailed discussion of the ongoing public consultation process, including public notification and the manner in which stakeholder feedback has been considered during Project planning.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Stakeholder #14				
1 Stakeholder #14	Email from Lynn Moore to: Project webmail D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment P. Milliken, MP S. Allan, Environment Canada T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education	29 June 2007	My property will be surrounded by turbines and will affect my health, my land value, my children and grand children's health.	Property value and health effects were assessed in the Draft EA report (please refer to Sections 7.14 and 7.16, respectively).
2 Stakeholder #14	Email from Lynn Moore to: Project webmail D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment P. Milliken, MP S. Allan, Environment Canada T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education	29 June 2007	Will also directly impact many birds and other wildlife on the Island.	The Draft EA assessed the potential effects to birds and other wildlife (please refer to Sections 7.8, 7.9, 7.10 respectively).

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
3 Stakeholder #14	Email from Lynn Moore to: Project webmail D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment P. Milliken, MP S. Allan, Environment Canada T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education	29 June 2007	I am not in favour of having turbines placed near my property, I feel they are unsafe and require proper planning and siting. Currently, placement of these turbines has not been demonstrated scientifically by the developer or council, and I feel that 350 metres is not sufficient to protect people.	Setbacks outlined in the Zoning By-law are prescribed by the local municipality, and are used as absolute minimums during the siting process. Actual setbacks are often larger than these minimums, and include incorporating noise guideline requirements set out by the MOE. Although there is some public debate on the need for scientific studies related to setbacks for wind turbines, many setbacks need to be developed on a site-specific basis, as features within a study area vary between wind projects.
4 Stakeholder #14	Email from Lynn Moore to: Project webmail D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment P. Milliken, MP S. Allan, Environment Canada T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education	29 June 2007	I am fearful that my well will be contaminated with either oil leakage from the turbines, or from sulphur due to the digging up of limestone so close to my property.	The potential effects of the Project on groundwater are addressed in Section 7.4 of the Draft EA. Excavation for foundations or installation of power lines and other infrastructure is a common construction practice for which standard mitigation measures exist. Detailed geotechnical work conducted at the location for each turbine tower will provide information on groundwater depth at each site prior to construction.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Stakeholder #14	Email from Lynn Moore to: Project webmail D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment P. Milliken, MP S. Allan, Environment Canada T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education	29 June 2007	I am appalled that a hydrogeological study was not done in the ERR to scientifically confirm negative impacts and mitigations efforts to protect people and livestock.	Please see response to Comment #4.
6 Stakeholder #14	Email from Lynn Moore to: Project webmail D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment P. Milliken, MP S. Allan, Environment Canada T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education	29 June 2007	I feel the turbines will impact my family, affecting current conditions that include migraines, noise sensitivity, diabetes, kidney ailments. No human impact studies are contained in this Environment Review to provide safeguards for humans.	The Draft EA assessed the potential effects to Public Health and Safety from the Project (please see Section 7.16 of the Final EA). Since release of the Draft EA, Stantec has completed literature search of published, peer-reviewed scientific literature to determine if there is scientific evidence of modern wind plants causing these potential health effects. Please see Section 7.16.2 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
7 Stakeholder #14	Email from Lynn Moore to: Project webmail D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment P. Milliken, MP S. Allan, Environment Canada T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education	29 June 2007	I am fearful that birds migrating across Island will be destroyed forever.	The Draft EA thoroughly assessed the potential effects to migrating birds (please refer to Section 7.9 and Technical Appendix C5)
8 Stakeholder #14	Email from Lynn Moore to: Project webmail D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment P. Milliken, MP S. Allan, Environment Canada T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education	29 June 2007	I also wish to notify you that I never received any notification by the developer, your consulting firm NOR our council members, that turbine were being proposed for Wolfe Island. I live in Kingston, and this is my seasonal residence.	As described in Section 5.0 of the Draft EA (Final EA – Section 5.0), public consultation for the Project has been ongoing for several years. Please note that any person who has shown an interest in the Project during that time has been added to the project contact list, and is sent notices directly. In response to stakeholder feedback, the Township of Frontenac Islands Council has endorsed a resolution that allows CREC access to the mailing list for all MPAC registered property owners in the Township. This has allowed for a mailout of the notification of release of the Final EA to all landowners, including those that do not live on the Island.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
9 Stakeholder #14	Email from Lynn Moore to: Project webmail D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment P. Milliken, MP S. Allan, Environment Canada T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education	29 June 2007	Will hold developer, CHD, leased land owners placing turbines next to my property, municipality, province and federal governments responsible for ensuring my health and welfare, and the health and welfare of my children and grandchildren.	This comment is beyond the scope of the EA.
10 Stakeholder #14	Email from Lynn Moore to: Project webmail D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources J. Gerretsen, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment P. Milliken, MP S. Allan, Environment Canada T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education	29 June 2007	Will take legal action to ensure laws are enforced to protect me and my family from any adverse affect of these massive industrial turbines.	This comment is beyond the scope of the EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Stakeholder #15				
1 Stakeholder #15	Fax Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Proposal has been rammed through local council, and in advance of environmental report.	The details related to the passing of the Zoning By-law amendment are under municipal jurisdiction and this amendment is part of the planning process. Disputes regarding the Zoning By-law have been resolved at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing in July 2007.
2 Stakeholder #15	Fax Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Consultation and communication with non-stakeholder owners and residents was virtually non-existent.	It should be clarified that a stakeholder is any person who has a potential interest, or who may be affected by the project. The EA process does not consider comments from people who may have a land-lease agreement as more important than any other comments. As detailed in Section 5.0 of the EA report, considerable consultation and communication with all stakeholders, including members of the public and government agencies has been ongoing throughout the entirety of the EA process.
3 Stakeholder #15	Fax Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Have not had time to study EA in detail, but report is biased and self-serving – which is to be expected when it is commissioned by the proponent.	The MOE's Environmental Screening Process for electricity projects is a proponent driven process, therefore it is a provincial requirement that CREC commission the preparation of the environmental assessment.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
4 Stakeholder #15	Fax Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	EA fails to adequately address issues to bird population and destruction, real visual and auditory impact of the towers on a relatively small, crowded landscape, the effect on non-participating neighbours/owners, bird-watching as an important tourist resource, construction timelines, transportation ferry interruptions, effect on the dump, effect on wetlands and inadequate setbacks, especially proximity to Big Sandy Bay, is not really answered.	While we appreciate your comment, specific details regarding issues you feel are not properly addressed in the EA would help us respond to your concerns in a more appropriate manner. The issues that you mention were assessed in the Draft EA. Please refer to the following sections: Birds:7.9 Viewscape:7.18 Environmental Noise:7.7 Tourism:7.13 Construction schedule: 1.8 Wolfe Island ferry: (this section has been updated to provide more detailed information in the Final EA, Section 7.15) Wolfe Island landfill: (this section has been updated to provide more detailed information in the Final EA, 7.19) Wetlands: 7.8 Setbacks: Section 2.5.5.2. The Final EA provides new information in Section 2.5.5.2
5 Stakeholder #15	Fax Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Cumulative effect of all the wind tower proposals for the area on both sides of the international boundary are not dealt with.	Cumulative effects of multiple wind power projects on both sides of the Canada-U.S. border was addressed in Section 8.0 of the Draft EA report (please refer to Section 8.0 of the Final EA).

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
6 Stakeholder #15	Fax Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	No guarantee that the transmission wires will all be underground	As discussed in Section 2.5.5.10 of the Draft EA, all transmission lines for the Project are planned as underground lines. The 230 kV transmission line will definitely be placed underground. The EA acknowledges that there may be certain areas of Wolfe Island where shallow bedrock will prevent installation of underground transmission lines. Please refer to Section 2.5.5.8, of the Final EA.
7 Stakeholder #15	Fax Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Any contract with the proponent should include guarantees of how the towers will be disposed of at the end of their life so that WI will not become a graveyard of 86 turbines	There will always be significant residual value in the materials and it will be economical to remove outdated equipment and machinery and possibly even repower in the future with modern machines in 25 to 30 years. CREC is contractually obligated to maintain the turbines in good working order, as well as decommission them.
8 Stakeholder #15	Fax Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Would like to see a peer-reviewed, independent study of this proposal	The EA is not prepared by the developer, and is extensively reviewed by regulatory agencies and agencies providing technical expertise. The experts at regulatory agencies have reviewed the Draft EA report, and the Final EA will also be subject to review by expert staff at these agencies (e.g. EC/CWS, MNR, DFO).

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Stakeholder #16				
1 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	Sickened by lack of fair, considered and open municipal procedure that Council showed Wolfe Island Wind Project. Two Councilors were in conflict due to leasing own land to turbines. Council didn't inform 800 WI taxpayers of WI WP	The actions of Council and Islander's representation on Frontenac Island's Council are political issues and are outside the scope of the EA process.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
2 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	CHD has lacked credible answers to questions. I was told personally by Geoff Carnegie that 86 turbines would make no more noise than a quiet room, and that house prices would not be devalued, and that his company had two US studies to prove it. John Keating said he guarantees tourism in WI will increase	The EA deals extensively with Environmental Noise, as discussed in section 7.7 of the Final EA, and Technical Appendix C4. Noise produced by the project will meet the MOE noise criteria at each and every non-participating receptor. A decline is property value is not anticipated as a result of the Project, as discussed in Section 7.14.2.2 and Technical Appendix C16 of the Draft EA. CREC has commissioned a property value study for Wolfe Island, which was provided as Technical Appendix C16 of the Draft EA and Final EA. CREC apologizes for the last statement, and has since retracted it. The comment was made out of excitement towards the project.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
3 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	These are samples of lack of credible information supplied by the developer, yet, this company's behaviour and plans seems to be condoned by all levels of government in their willingness to give CHD money	The Government of Canada, through various initiatives over time, has outlined for Canadians an evolving policy framework for honouring our international environmental commitments and for fostering the development of renewable energy sources such as wind within Canada. The Canadian government has initiated these activities as a matter of good public policy that serves to better the environment and enhance the lives of Canadians. This includes the new federal ecoENERGY for Renewable Power program, which will provide an incentive of one cent per kilowatt-hour for up to 10 years to eligible low-impact, renewable electricity projects such as the Wolfe Island Wind Project, once operational. However, the financial burden for construction of the wind plant belongs entirely to CREC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Canadian Hydro Developers and all associated economic risks are the sole responsibility of CREC.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
4 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	Provincial government has not provided any legislation to protect people and set standards with regards to turbine power plants	Government legislation is a political issue and is outside the scope of the EA. The Project will meet all relevant legislative requirements, as described in Technical Appendix F.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	Now we find that the draft ERR supplied by CHD is an extension of the lack of in-depth and believable information that CHD has supplied.	The EA is not prepared by the developer, and is extensively reviewed by regulatory agencies and agencies providing technical expertise.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
6 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	By-laws passed without ESR – Mayor misled residents and landowners by stating they would not make decisions until after ESR was released for public debate	The details related to the passing of the Zoning By-law amendment are under municipal jurisdiction and this amendment is part of the planning process. Disputes regarding the Zoning By-law have been resolved at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing in July 2007.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
7 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	Open houses held without ESR – no information pertaining to impacts on people, wildlife, or environment were provided	Usually, the EA report is not available before or during Public Open Houses. EA is an iterative process that includes public consultation, and the EA report includes information and feedback obtained from the public during the open houses. General information on many topics was presented and discussed, and many project team representatives of various roles and specialties attended in order to answer as many questions as possible.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
8 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	ERR identifies WI as level 4 IBA – this was never discussed at open houses, nor was public informed of global and continental significance of environmental impact and developers plans to mitigate impacts	Wolfe Island's status as an Important Bird Area ("IBA") was mentioned in the Environmental Overview Report (released March 2006), in responses to individual stakeholder concerns, during discussions at Public Open Houses, and in the Draft EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
9 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	Bill Moore of PPM Atlantic Renewable stated that 6 years ago, looked at Cape Vincent, after doing initial study, concluded that Cape Vincent was not a good location due to prime migratory flight paths, from both lake and river, for a variety of birds.	As CREC has not seen this study, we cannot comment on its results.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
10 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	ERR does not address effect that 352 turbines slated for Wolfe, Simcoe, Amherst Islands, and Cape Vincent and Clayton NY will have on birds and wildlife. Discussions on wetlands is cursory.	The predicted level of cumulative impact was assessed in the Draft EA. The Cumulative Effects Assessment considers the cumulative effects between the Wolfe Island Project and proposed U.S. wind power projects, including potential effects to birds and other wildlife. Please refer to Section 8.0 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
11 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	Report overlooks negative effects to bird migration that is certain to occur when putting 86 turbines in midst of wetlands, flyways, and breeding grounds.	Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Draft EA and Final EA summarize the potential effects to all groups of birds, including effects on migrants. No turbines are proposed in wetlands.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
12 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	CHD was requested to do more in-depth studies by EC in 2005, 2006, and to provide up to a three-year study, and install a test turbine for review. None of these precautionary steps were taken to provide empirical data on bird impacts.	Stantec has been working closely with EC/CWS throughout the course of the project, and EC has approved the workplans for bird studies conducted for the Project. EC/CWS have provided comments on the Draft EA (please see Appendix G8 of the Final EA for their comments).

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
13 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	WI has always had problems around securing potable water – after all, it sits on top of a large sulphur limestone bed. The ERR states that the developer has not done a complete water table assessment, but merely a 'field study assessment' The impact of drilling for 86 turbines is sure to have a negative effect on the Island's water supply.	The potential effects of the Project on groundwater are addressed in Section 7.4 of the Draft EA. Excavation for foundations or installation of power lines and other infrastructure is a common construction practice for which standard mitigation measures exist. Detailed geotechnical work conducted at the location for each turbine tower will provide information on groundwater depth at each site prior to construction.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
14 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	Negative physical effects from noise and the flickering caused by sunlight on blades into people's homes, as well as the potential of vibroacoustic disease has not been discussed by the developer.	Potential health effects resulting from low frequency noise ("LFN") were discussed in Section 7.16 of the Draft EA. As explained in the report, research to date has not shown any biological health effects at levels normally associated with modern operational turbines. Please refer to Section 7.16.2.2 of the Final EA. Shadow flicker is not anticipated to be a significant effect of the Project, and has been modelled to quantify the potential effect, as discussed in Section 7.12 and Technical Appendix C14. Furthermore, the potential effects to health as a result of shadow flicker are discussed in Section 7.12 of the EA. Very little information exists on potential health effects from wind plants in peer-reviewed, scientific literature, although much information is available in the popular media (e.g., internet). Since release of the Draft EA, Stantec has completed literature search of published, peer-reviewed scientific literature to determine if there is scientific evidence that modern wind plants cause some of the potential health effects often cited in the popular media (e.g., vibroacoustic disease). Please see Section 7.16 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
15 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	Visual impact on WI and Kingston will be that of environmental freak show. The developer did not supply visual representation of the Project until March 2007. Why not? Because of the sheer brutal visual impact the turbines will have to Island and Kingston Residents. Seeing these visual representations had people leaving the Open House in tears.	A project layout was required to prepare visual simulations. Visual simulations were presented at the second Public Open House, which we considered an appropriate time to present this information. The significance of Project effects to the viewscape has been rated Medium in the Draft EA, as positive or negative depending on the user's subjective opinion. Please refer to Section 7.18 and Technical Appendix C11 of the Final EA for discussions on potential effects to the local viewscape.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
16 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	In spite of what CHD says, turbines will devalue property in their vicinity and beyond – especially those on the water and with a vista of the turbines.	The property value section in the Draft EA reviewed available literature on effects to property value from wind plants worldwide (see Section 7.14.2.2 of the Draft EA and Final EA). In addition, CREC has commissioned a property value study for Wolfe Island, which was provided as Technical Appendix C16 of the Draft EA and Final EA. A decline in property value is not anticipated as a result of this Project.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
17 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	The developer neglected to supply a representation of the mass of the cumulative view of all the turbines designed for the St. Lawrence Seaway.	We did not simulate the view from proposed wind plants since they may or may not be approved. Only the turbine layout for this Project was available at a high enough level of detail to produce the simulations.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
18 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	In spite of what CHD says, tourism is not likely to increase. It is likely to suffer negative effects (on Wolfe Island and the City of Kingston). What birdwatcher wants to visit a locale filled with turbines? What B&B guest wants to stay at a venue overlooking an industrial power plant? What romantic couple or family on bikes wants to visit an Island that has become an environmental freak show?	Potential effects to tourism have been assessed as part of the Draft EA. Please refer to Section 7.13 and Technical Appendix C12 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
19 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	Freshwater sailing in Kingston will suffer. Kingston Yacht Club as well as CORK is adamantly opposed to project as there is likelihood number of turbines will change wind currents and negative visual impact from water will turn sailors away. What is now the freshwater sailing capital will be abandoned. Large turbine vistas agitate and upset people. Sailors will not come to Kingston. They will choose vistas that relax and can be enjoyed.	CREC has been working with the Kingston Yacht Club and CORK and has provided an analysis of potential effects to sailing conditions in Section 7.13 of the EA. Please see comment # 16 for information on visual impacts.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
20 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	I hope that some level of government – whichever level it takes – can see what a flawed, one-sided and strictly proponent-driven procedure has taken place around Wolfe Island's proposed turbine power plant.	This comment is directed at the MOE. CREC is unable to respond on behalf of the agency.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
21 Stakeholder #16	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: P. Milliken, MP J. Gerresten, MPP L. Broten, Minister of the Environment D. Duncan, Minister of Energy D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources T. McMeekin, Ministry of Education S. Allan, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	If the provincial and federal governments are hoping to make themselves shine in their attempts to look pro-actively green by developing a turbine plant in the middle of one of the most beautiful and bird-rich locations in Ontario – an environment jewel in the St. Lawrence – it will only end up trying to mitigate the disastrous effects to people and wildlife that are sure to occur with this project. (And, Mr. Keating, that I can guarantee…)	This comment is directed at the MOE. CREC is unable to respond on behalf of the agency.
Stakeholder #17				
1 Stakeholder #17	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: L. Broten, Minister of the Environment	22 July 2007	Writing to express opposition to the proposal to locate 86 wind turbines on Wolfe Island. I am not against wind turbines per say but their location must be appropriate to the local and broader environmental context. Wind turbines are not environmentally neutral and I believe the proposed number will have a negative environmental impact on the Island and surrounding area.	Section 7.0 of the EA discusses potential effects, mitigation measures, and net effects of the Project.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
2 Stakeholder #17	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: L. Broten, Minister of the Environment	22 July 2007	For instance, the combined footprint of 86 turbines is significant and will take large portions of the Island's agricultural land out of production (e.g. pasture land)	Effects on agricultural practices on Wolfe Island are anticipated to be low. Although some land will be taken out of agricultural use over the Project's lifecycle, these effects are compensated for by the economic value of the Land Lease Agreements and no significant net negative effects are anticipated to prime agricultural lands, operations, and infrastructure. Please refer to Section 7.11 and Technical Appendix C1 of the Final EA.
3 Stakeholder #17	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: L. Broten, Minister of the Environment	22 July 2007	These turbines will damage some of the Island's wetland environment	The Project is not anticipated to have significant net effects on Surface Water Quality, Soil Erosion, and Fisheries Habitat (discussed in Section 7.3 of the Final EA) or Terrestrial and Wetland Flora and Fauna (discussed in Section 7.8 of the Final EA).
4 Stakeholder #17	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: L. Broten, Minister of the Environment	22 July 2007	(These turbines will) pose a risk to migratory and nesting birds	A thorough assessment has been made of potential effects to wildlife, including migrating and nesting birds. The sections have been reviewed and commented on by several regulating agencies, including Environment Canada and the Ministry of Natural Resources, as well as Ducks Unlimited Canada. Please refer to Section 7.9 of the Final EA and Technical Appendix C5.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Stakeholder #17	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: L. Broten, Minister of the Environment	22 July 2007	(These turbines) will produce significant noise and visual pollution.	The EA deals extensively with Environmental Noise, as discussed in section 7.7 of the Final EA, and Technical Appendix C4. Noise produced by the project will meet the MOE noise criteria at each and every non-participating receptor. The significance of Project effects to the viewscape has been rated Medium in the Draft EA, as positive or negative depending on the user's subjective opinion. Please refer to Section 7.18 and Technical Appendix C11 of the Final EA for discussions on potential effects to the local viewscape.
6 Stakeholder #17	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: L. Broten, Minister of the Environment	22 July 2007	Ontario's energy demand is escalating. I believe that the fast tracking of wind turbines in the Province is taking vital attention away from addressing the real and more difficult solutions to controlling greenhouse gas emissions and energy demand through for instance, aggressive measures to cap and reduce energy consumption by Ontario residents and industry.	Policy initiatives fall within government jurisdiction and are therefore outside the scope of the Environmental Assessment.
7 Stakeholder #17	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: L. Broten, Minister of the Environment	22 July 2007	Wind energy will not reduce the public's or industries' current flagrant wasting of electricity nor reduce the demand for fossil duel or nuclear powered electrical generating stations.	Wind energy is one part of the solution. Please see Section 1.3.3 for discussion on the energy supply mix for the province, and Section 1.11 for a description of the need, purpose, and alternative methods for the Project.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
8 Stakeholder #17	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: L. Broten, Minister of the Environment	22 July 2007	Increasing the number of wind turbines in the province will make people feel more comfortable about their electrical use rather than spurring them to take the necessary action to reduce its use.	Energy-use patterns of the public is outside the scope of the Environmental Assessment.
9 Stakeholder #17	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: L. Broten, Minister of the Environment	22 July 2007	The province needs to fully exploit energy reduction to control greenhouse gas emissions and the increasing demand for energy: Provincial energy reduction targets need to be defined; vigorous energy consumption limits need to be applied to Ontario residents and industries;	Policy initiatives fall within government jurisdiction and are therefore outside the scope of the Environmental Assessment.
10 Stakeholder #17	Received correspondence from MOE Email addressed to: L. Broten, Minister of the Environment	22 July 2007	Application of new "alternative" energy sources needs to be done with the careful consideration of the associated environmental impact.	We fully agree. Environmental assessments are extensively reviewed by several government agencies who ensure policies and procedures are followed, and all relevant guidelines are met.
Stakeholder #18				
1 Stakeholder #18	Received correspondence from MOE Letter addressed to: Laurel Broten	26 June 2007	Such turbines should be installed a minimum of 1 ½ miles from the nearest habitation because of the negative effect of such low frequency noise on human health – the higher the tower, the greater the negative impact.	Potential health effects resulting from low frequency noise ("LFN") were discussed in Section 7.16 of the Draft EA. As explained in the report, research to date has not shown any biological health effects at levels normally associated with modern operational turbines. Please refer to Section 7.16.2.2 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
2 Stakeholder #18	Received correspondence from MOE Letter addressed to: Laurel Broten	26 June 2007	This whole island is part of a migration route for birds and a staging ground for waterfowl and this is NOT the place for wind turbines where more birds will be killed here than other locations.	A thorough assessment has been made of potential effects to wildlife, including migrating birds and staging waterfowl. The sections have been reviewed and commented on by several regulating agencies, including Environment Canada and the Ministry of Natural Resources, as well as Ducks Unlimited Canada. Please refer to Section 7.9 and Technical Appendix C5 of the Final EA.
3 Stakeholder #18	Received correspondence from MOE Letter addressed to: Laurel Broten	26 June 2007	Scandinavian countries are installing their turbines well out to sea; we can do the same in our Great Lakes without all these environmental and other disturbances.	This Environmental Assessment evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with this specific project, at this specific location. The potential effects of installing turbines in the Great Lakes is outside the scope of this Environmental Assessment.

2.2.2 Comments from OMB Appellants and WIRE

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Eliot, Smith Barristers & Solicitors (representing WIRE)				
1 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	The proponent failed to communicate to the public that Wolfe Island is an Important Bird Area. None of the open houses have offered information on the critical importance of the Island as an Important Bird Area. None of the protected or important bird species were identified.	Wolfe Island's status as an Important Bird Area ("IBA") was mentioned in the Environmental Overview Report (released March 2006), in responses to individual stakeholder concerns, during discussions at Public Open Houses, and in the Draft EA.
2 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and	19 June 2007	No attempt to engage the community in the identification and recording of the birds.	Trained field staff following Environment Canada-approved protocols conducted field surveys. However, wildlife observations submitted by local birders to the project team throughout the Project were also considered during data analysis and report writing.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
	Wildlife Service			
3 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	CREC knew in fall 2006 that the ERR wouldn't be released as promised, but did not convey this to the public.	The timeline established for the project was a "best estimate", however delays are common with any complex development such as this. Additional studies were conducted in response to public concerns and as a result delayed the release of the EA.
4 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	Not communicated to the public: the visual impact of the towers will be considerable	Visual simulations could not be completed until the project layout had been established. They were presented to the public at the second Public Open House, a common time in the EA process to present this information. Size specifications for the turbines have been available and presented to the public since early 2006.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	The report fails to recognize or consider the additional impact of the 100 towers planned by CREC for Amherst Island.	As Amherst Island is greater than 10 km from Wolfe Island, it was not considered in the cumulative effects analysis. Furthermore, Canadian Hydro Developers has no definitive plans for the Amherst Island project at this time.
6 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	None of the 256 “receptors” have been notified of who they were, and many may not be aware that they could potentially be affected by the project.	“Receptor” and “non-participating receptors” are definitions used by the MOE and within the Environmental Noise Impact Assessment. A receptor is any building/structure within 1000 m of a wind turbine (thus any residents on Wolfe Island). A non-participating receptor is the term used to describe any building/structure located on land that is not being used by the wind project (i.e., does not have a wind turbine on its property) but is still within 1000 m of a wind turbine. Any noise produced by the project must meet the noise criteria at every non-participating receptor.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
7 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	CREC says in the press that tourism will go through the roof, but the EA does not conclude this.	CREC apologizes and has retracted this statement, which was made out of excitement towards the project.
8 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	The mitigation methods are proposed, not promised. However, the conclusions are based on the mitigation methods being acted upon.	The mitigation measures were proposed, as the EA needed to undergo agency and public review. Once finalized, CREC will legally have to adhere to the recommendations made in the EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
9 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	Report fails to accurately reflect the real bird population on the island.	A multi-year bird monitoring program has been developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and the MNR. Multi-year studies conducted for the project include: habitat surveys, wintering raptors, spring waterfowl, spring raptor and passerine migration, fall waterfowl, fall raptor and passerine migration, breeding birds, and species at risk and focused on identifying areas of high use or areas of importance. Additional surveys conducted in spring and summer 2007 have been considered in preparation of the Final EA.
10 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	The MNR recommended in 2004 that the proponent consider establishing test turbines. This recommendation was not acted upon.	The MNR recommendation was not a requirement. In 2004, enough data regarding the wind regime on Wolfe Island had already been gathered to formulate a detailed project development strategy. Therefore, test turbines were determined to be unnecessary and not economical.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
11 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	EC told proponent that WI cannot be compared to incidence of bird kill at other projects. The proponent did not convey this information, and even had 2 birds/turbine/yr on an open house board.	The Final EA and Technical Appendix C5 have been revised to reflect the results of more recent mortality studies, and to note the characteristics of the Wolfe Island site.
12 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	There is no discussion as to what size area the amount of activity required throughout the construction period will disrupt or impact upon at any given time.	A schematic of a turbine construction site has been provided in Figure 2.6, and an estimated amount of activity during construction is described in Section 2.0. This level of detail is all that can be provided at this stage of project planning.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
13 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	If either of the proposed sites for a cement batching plant are used, the location will be such that construction will impact the entire project area throughout the construction period.	The potential effects associated with a cement batching plant are assessed in the EA (Sections 2.5.5.14 and 7.7., Environmental Noise)
14 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	There is no discussion of the impact of placing over 30 towers in the western corner of the island (e.g. how much habitat they will displace, impact on any field bird needs, disturbance to bald eagle population or short-eared owls)	Effects on grassland birds, Bald Eagles, and Short-eared Owls were discussed in the Draft EA. Technical Appendix C5 and Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of the Final EA have been expanded to discuss the amount of habitat displaced, and the results of field studies that were conducted in the study area, focusing on the northwestern portion of the study area, in spring and summer 2007.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
15 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	OPA and ZBA were passed prior to release of the EA, even though RFP and EA schedules say they would be obtained afterwards.	The details related to the passing of the Zoning By-law amendment are under municipal jurisdiction and this amendment is part of the planning process. Disputes regarding the Zoning By-law have been resolved at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing in July 2007.
16 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	Total tax benefit to Township is stated as 111,000. There is no record or reference to the current tax bill for the properties involved, so it is not possible to know what the increase will actually be.	The estimate for Wolfe Island taxes was provided by a property tax consultant. There have been no tax bills, and there will not be any until construction is completed. Therefore, the best estimate that can be provided at this time is based on the municipal tax rates and the project cost.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
17 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	The report states that tax money will be paid to the school boards. There is no basis to support that statement. Schools in Ontario are not planned or maintained relative to the local tax base.	This statement was made in error, and has been corrected. Appropriate changes have been made to Appendix C13 and throughout the text of the Final EA.
18 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	The report states an amenities benefit to WI of 645,000. The Twp shares revenue by a 54-46% split. Therefore, the benefit to WI will be 350,000	Allocation of funds received as a result of the Amenities Agreement is up to the Township and Council to determine.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
19 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	There are no clear answers about how workers and equipment/supplies will be transported to the island.	As stated in the Draft EA (Section 7.15.3), CREC has been continuing to examine various options for the transportation of Project components and workers to and from the Island. More detail on traffic management is now available, and is provided in Section 7.15 and Technical Appendix I of the Final EA.
20 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	Report does not estimate the impact in years the proponents use may have on the Wolfe Island landfill.	Section 7.19 of the Final EA has been updated to provide more detailed information on the disposal of waste during construction and operation. The Island landfill will only be used for the permitted waste in which it accepts, which does not include construction material. Effects to the landfill during operation are expected to be negligible.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
21 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	There is no study that documents the ecological function of each of the 7 PSWs, and if or how they are interdependent.	A large amount of information was collected by the MNR during their formal evaluation of each of the individual units of the Wolfe Island Wetland Complex PSW. This information was reviewed and summarized in Technical Appendix C7, and additional breeding bird studies were carried out in 2007 in wetlands that are within 500 m of proposed turbines.
22 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	There is no study that assesses the potential impact to the species and vegetation supported in each wetland during the construction period, only that it will be “mitigated” if necessary.	Potential effects to wetland species and vegetation, including details on mitigation, are discussed in Sections 7.8, 7.9 and 7.10. More detail regarding mitigation through setbacks to the wetlands has been provided in Section 7.8.3 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
23 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	The mitigation proposals are untested and voluntary.	The majority of mitigation measures are standard practice during any type of construction. Mitigation during operation is based on CREC / Canadian Hydro Developers' and the wind industry's experience with operating wind plants. Once an EA has been approved, all mitigation measures are legally binding.
24 Eliot, Smith (representing WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail T. Sullivan, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service M. Cousineau, Environment Canada A. Manville, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service T. Rich, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	19 June 2007	CREC ignored EC's comments about the placement of the towers in the northwest corner of the island, and in fact have increased the density in that area.	The turbine layout has been designed by carefully balancing many factors (please see Section 2.5.5.2 of the Final EA). Stantec has been working closely with EC/CWS throughout the course of the project. EC/CWS have provided comments on the Draft EA (please see Appendix G8 of the Final EA for their comments). CREC will continue to work with EC/CWS.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Eliot, Smith Barristers & Solicitors (representing J. Day)				
1 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail	21 June 2007	J. Day has reviewed the Draft EA, and will forward his comments once the final draft is posted.	The reason for releasing the EA report in Draft for stakeholder review was to obtain feedback from the public. The MOE responded to this email and encouraged comments to be submitted to project team prior to release of Final EA. Comments were subsequently submitted (see Comments 16-31.
2 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail	21 June 2007	It is Dr Day's opinion that it would be unreasonable and unacceptable to allow a project of this magnitude, situated in a designated IBA, to proceed without further studies on the cumulative impact of this project and others planned for the area.	The predicted level of cumulative impact was assessed in the Draft EA. The Cumulative Effects Assessment considers the cumulative effects between the Wolfe Island Project and proposed U.S. wind power projects, including potential effects to birds and other wildlife. Please refer to Section 8.0 of the Final EA.
3 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail	21 June 2007	We are attaching a copy of comments made by the New York State Department of Public Service on the draft impact statement for a proposed facility in Cape Vincent, New York.	The comments have been made on another project, however we thank you for providing the additional information.
4 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail	21 June 2007	"Monitoring" the numbers of important and protected birds and their habitat is not an acceptable response. The potential harm is irreparable.	A commitment to the post-construction monitoring program has been provided in Section 9.4.2.3. The program will be developed in collaboration with EC/CWS and the MNR, and Ducks Unlimited Canada may also be involved in the development of the monitoring program. Unanticipated effects will be dealt with through the "adaptive management" portion of the post-construction monitoring agreement.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail	21 June 2007	We would expect that the proponent of the WI project be directed to produce an alternative project for consideration.	The EA process for the Wolfe Island Wind Power Project is determined by Ontario Regulation 116/01 and the associated *Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Electricity Projects* prepared by the Ministry of the Environment (available at: http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/envision/gp/4021e.pdf) as well as Canadian Environmental Assessment Act screening requirements. Assessment of an alternative project is not a requirement of the EA process.
6 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	25 June 2007	The report indicates that the purpose of the report is to fill the provincial EA requirements, and to "simulate" compliance with the requirements under federal legislation as well. We are writing to state that we find this "simulation" to be unacceptable. The proponent cannot simulate compliance with a federal process, without giving the community impacted by the proposed project, the rights that go with that process.	The word “simulation” is not used in the Draft EA. The report has been harmonized to meet both the federal and provincial requirements.
7 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	25 June 2007	It is our opinion that CHD and Stantec have failed to establish that the WI project is not likely to cause significant adverse effects. Topics that haven’t been properly addressed: birds, transportation, waste management, public health, public access to unopened road allowances, and wildlife habitat.	Detail regarding which issues you feel are unclear would be helpful and would allow us to better address your concerns. The topics that you mention were addressed in the Draft EA. Please refer to the following sections of the Final EA: Birds: Section 7.9 Transportation: Section 7.15 Waste management: Section 7.19 Public health and Safety: Section 7.16 Please note that some of these sections have been significantly updated since the release of the Draft EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
8 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	25 June 2007	We are asking that the project be referred to a review panel on the basis of (a) significant adverse environmental effects, and (b) public concern.	As per Sheila Allan's email reply to this correspondence, your comments and questions about the federal EA process and request for a review panel are best directed to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency.
9 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	25 June 2007	The significant adverse environmental effects have been clearly identified by both the MNR and EC, and clearly communicated to the proponent since 2004. However, those effects have not been made public until recently.	Project planning and environmental assessment activities have been ongoing since 2004. CREC and Stantec have remained in contact with MNR and EC throughout the course of the Project, and have a good understanding of the agencies' requirements.
10 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	25 June 2007	Our client WIRE has collected almost 200 signatures requesting our council to rescind the zoning bylaw that was passed prior to the release of the draft environmental assessment report.	The details related to the passing of the Zoning By-law amendment are under municipal jurisdiction and this amendment is part of the planning process. Disputes regarding the Zoning By-law have been resolved at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing in July 2007.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
11 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	25 June 2007	Since this report was released, the level of concern in the community has been very high, and the only assurance the community has received from it's municipal councillors is that the matters are "out of their hands" and will be dealt with through the environmental process.	We cannot address this comment since it is a political issue and is outside the scope of the EA process.
12 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail	25 June 2007	Several environmental groups, in both Canada and the United States, have reviewed the report, and wish to make submissions on the adverse impact this project will have on an important environmental area of the Great Lakes region.	All comments received were considered during the preparation of the Final EA.
13 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	26 June 2007	Please note that we are expecting to submit at least 3 more comments from bird experts: 1) Rhonda Milliken, author of the Ecotrack study relied upon by Stantec to support the absence of nocturnal studies, 2) a bobolink expert, and 3) Bill Evans of Ithica, NY	All comments received were considered during the preparation of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
	D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment			
14 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	26 June 2007	We note at least 51 watercrossings, including 3 through Sand Bay PSW.	The number of watercourse crossings has been minimized to reduce environmental impact and reduce project design / construction and operation costs. The use of watercourse crossings is a balance between a variety of siting criteria including environmental impacts, road length, stakeholder feedback, cable length, crane demobilization/remobilization, temporary vs. permanent crossings, safety, etc. Electrical lines and access roads have been carefully sited to maximize use of existing crossing points such as along existing roads etc. Route selection attempted to minimize the number of crossings, and where crossings were necessary, air photo and Lidar information was used to select apparently lower quality areas to cross (e.g., if a choice was required, an altered drainage ditch would be selected for crossing rather than a more natural-looking watercourse. Where possible, additional access points were used for adjacent turbines to avoid watercourse crossings. All watercourse crossings will be reviewed by DFO, MNR and Transport Canada-Marine throughout the entire study area as well as by these agencies and Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority on the mainland.
15	Email to: S. Allan, Environment	26 June 2007	We note that the report submitted by Doug Howell, in contemplation of construction around the old canal, was	We have received the study, and it was considered during preparation of the Final EA. Although restoration

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment		not considered, and that this is the type of study that is required before the project commences to ensure environmental damage will not occur.	of the Wolfe Island Canal appears to be a very worthwhile proposition, it has little relation to assessment of the environmental effects of the Wolfe Island Wind Project. We did find the background information useful and similar to what we discovered during our literature reviews.
16 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from J. Day	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment	04 July 2007	Methods starts with times of the surveys and contains isolated observations on selected days. It is unclear why these individual dates are chosen but in none of the surveys is there any comprehensive assessment.	The bird monitoring program was developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and MNR. Dates were selected to ensure the most appropriate coverage of each species group during their peak activity periods.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
	Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment			
17 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from J. Day	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	04 July 2007	Report did not take into account large concentrations of waterfowl in the late fall of 2005 through the winter of 2006, in a locality where turbines are proposed. Selected times are obviously outdated and overlook the considerable dynamic on the island	Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Draft EA indicated that Wolfe Island is known for its regular large concentrations of waterfowl. Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA have been revised to incorporate Canadian Wildlife Service waterfowl survey information collected between 1986 and 1999, and the results of surveys conducted by Stantec in spring 2007. Surveys conducted in fall 2007, intended to supplement baseline information, will be released under separate cover.
18 Eliot, Smith (representing J.	Email to: Project webmail cc.	04 July 2007	Background Data Review gives sources, many of which are outdated and do not reflect current status	In our opinion, the data sources listed are relevant, and are intended to supplement detailed field studies carried out in the study area between 2004 and 2007.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Day) – comments from J. Day	D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment			
19 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from J. Day	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment	04 July 2007	Weather conditions reported in spring waterfowl survey states overcast skies with very little wind or clear skies and not time of day or duration of observation are conditions in which waterfowl rarely move. It is windy rainy conditions in low pressure systems, which produce movement of waterfowl – thus observations are not valid	We respectfully disagree – weather conditions reported in Technical Appendix C5 included several windy days and one survey with variable light to very hard rain. We believe the time of day at which the surveys were conducted was ideal for observing waterfowl movement. Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA report on additional spring waterfowl surveys carried out in 2007, under a variety of weather conditions.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
	Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment			
20 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from J. Day	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	04 July 2007	Report does not address waterfowl movement on the south shore and inland and only acknowledges documented numbers in my letter of May 30, 2006.	Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA report on additional spring waterfowl surveys carried out in 2007.
21 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental	04 July 2007	Attached map of 2004 does not designate properly the shoreline immediately west of 5th Line Road, site of the largest concentrations of mallards, black ducks and pintails on WI and the movements of these birds from this locale in their foraging trips at first light and dusk and in rainy or snowy conditions. This observation is not	The noted map is intended to show NEA's 2004 observations. Aerial surveys conducted by the Canadian Wildlife Service between 1986 and 1999 confirm that the south shore is important for dabblers, and this information, along with the results of spring 2007 waterfowl surveys, has been added to Technical

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
J. Day	Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment		properly acknowledged in this report.	Appendix C5.
22 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from J. Day	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment	04 July 2007	Report mostly uses outdated observations, which are carried out at times of minimal usage i.e. late October, when concentrations of waterfowl occur in November, December and beyond.	Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA have been revised to incorporate Canadian Wildlife Service waterfowl survey information collected between 1986 and 1999, and the results of surveys conducted by Stantec in spring 2007. Ongoing surveys conducted in fall 2007, intended to supplement baseline information, will be released under separate cover.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
	Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment			
23 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from J. Day	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	04 July 2007	Coping strategies are speculative and in this circumstance, at least probably dead wrong.	Published and unpublished studies of the direct and indirect effects of wind turbines on birds at operating wind power facilities were reviewed and considered in assessing potential effects for the project. The projected effects will be the subject of a thorough post-construction monitoring program, to be developed in collaboration with EC/CWS and MNR. Any unanticipated effects will be addressed through the “adaptive management” portion of the post-construction monitoring agreement.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
24 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from J. Day	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	04 July 2007	Turbine in Toronto simply doesn't represent the turbine conditions at the proposed site on WI, even though it is regularly used as an example of wildlife adaptability and low impact.	No wind plants have been constructed in areas similar to the Study Area. Environment Canada's "Wind Turbines and Birds: A Background Review for Environmental Assessment" (April, 2007) contains a current review of over 200 international studies, however, the accuracy of mortality rate estimates varies widely depending on study methodology and the application of correction factors. Accordingly, reference to the rate of mortality has been removed from Section 1.12.1.
25 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from J. Day	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment	04 July 2007	Report overlooks WI location as being unique with respect to focused bird migration, i.e. first land bridge on eastern Lake Ontario and foraging activities during this process	Field studies carried out in spring 2004 and 2006 and fall 2004 and 2007 did not detect the presence of significant numbers of staging passerines or potentially important stopover habitat for these species. CREC commissioned a radar-acoustic study of bats and nocturnally migrating birds in fall 2007 to supplement baseline data. As well, fall raptor migration surveys were carried out in fall 2007. Results will be provided under separate cover.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
	Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment			
26 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from J. Day	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	04 July 2007	Prime habitat in certain areas leads to unusual concentrations of bird life including unusual numbers of raptors which have been proven to be highly susceptible to turbines and waterfowl which pass through the region in thousands with large flocks remaining over an extended period to forage on agricultural land.	Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Draft and Final EA indicate the importance of the study area for these groups of birds.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
27 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from J. Day	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	04 July 2007	Report states that waterfowl and other birds alter height to avoid collision but does not provide any justification for this statement and disregards conditions in which the birds move and the numbers involved.	Published and unpublished studies of the direct and indirect effects of wind turbines on birds at operating wind power facilities were reviewed and considered in assessing potential effects for the project. Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA have been revised to incorporate the results of waterfowl surveys conducted in spring 2007, which include specific numbers and flight altitude observations. Ongoing surveys conducted in fall 2007, intended to supplement baseline information, will be released under separate cover.
28 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from J. Day	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment	04 July 2007	Grassland birds not only are at risk from turbine collisions, considering close proximity of individual units, but are also likely to abandon prime habitat which has been observed elsewhere	This potential effect was noted in Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
	Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment			
29 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from J. Day	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	04 July 2007	Post construction monitoring will be too late - it is best to withhold construction especially in areas of high sensitivity until safe siting of turbines may be undertaken	The projected effects will be the subject of a thorough post-construction monitoring program, to be developed in collaboration with EC/CWS and MNR. Any unanticipated effects will be addressed through the “adaptive management” portion of the post-construction monitoring agreement.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
30 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from J. Day	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	04 July 2007	There is increasing evidence that mortality rates were underestimated in the past and that a much greater number of mortality have been observed recently on the Maple Ridge wind project in upper New York 70 km from WI	The Final EA and Technical Appendix C5 have been revised to reflect the results of more recent mortality studies, and to note the specific characteristics of the Wolfe Island site.
31 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from J. Day	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency J. Fischer, Environment	04 July 2007	Ample evidence that there is insufficient information about bird populations, migration, and movement on WI which is recognized to be a prime migratory route and a staging area and that a moratorium of 2 to 3 years is required to obtain enough data on bird usage of WI to allow this project to proceed without jeopardizing the application of wind power generally	The bird monitoring program was developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and MNR. Dates were selected to ensure the most appropriate coverage of each species group during their peak activity periods. The revised Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA report on additional surveys carried out in spring and summer, 2007. Ongoing surveys conducted in fall 2007, intended to supplement baseline information, will be released under separate cover.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
	Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment			
1 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from J. Day	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project Webmail	31 July 2007	I am an appellant at the OMB hearings regarding the wind project on Wolfe Island. I prepared a submission and expected to appear before the Board.	No response necessary.
2 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from J. Day	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project Webmail	31 July 2007	Familiar with scope and size of wind project scheduled for WI and potential for severe environmental consequences particularly in respect to wildlife	No response necessary.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
3 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from J. Day	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project Webmail	31 July 2007	As an applicant and expert in wildlife, I had prepared a presentation scheduled for mid-week, but the Township and proponents argues that issues would be dealt with through the Environmental Appeal, and that the Township and proponents argued that the government could make changes if necessary and it was not the Township's role. Settlement indicated that 'all parties agree that the assessment and mitigation of environmental issues is of paramount importance" and I agree with this.	No response necessary.
4 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from J. Day	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project Webmail	31 July 2007	Request public consultation on the matter and hope to have opportunity to make submissions to this process particularly in recognition of WI as a critical land bridge for migrating birds, butterflies and bats, and that there is a continuum into the United States and thus has international significance.	As detailed in Section 5.0 of the EA report, considerable consultation and communication with all stakeholders, including members of the public and government agencies has been ongoing throughout the entirety of the EA process. In addition to having the opportunity to comment on the Draft EA, the public now has the opportunity to submit comments on the final EA during the formal Notice of Completion 30 day review and comment period.
5 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from J. Day	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project Webmail	31 July 2007	Accordingly, proposed wind projects not only impact on Wolfe Island but also northern New York State directly south and the effects on migratory birds would be cumulative	The predicted level of cumulative impact was assessed in the Draft EA. The Cumulative Effects Assessment considers the cumulative effects between the Wolfe Island Project and proposed U.S. wind power projects, including potential effects to birds and other wildlife. Please refer to Section 8.0 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Eliot, Smith Barristers & Solicitors (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Gerry Smith				
1 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	Mr. Day has retained Mr. Gerry Smith to review the bird study that accompanied the Draft EA, Mr. Smith has provided the attached comments.	Comments have been reviewed and were considered during preparation of the Final EA (see Comments 4-22)
2 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	Please note that we have also retained a number of other specialists and authors of some of the studies relied upon in the report to comment on the conclusions. We expect the conclusions will be as per Mr. Smiths; that the siting of the towers as planned should not proceed without further bird studies	All comments received were considered during the preparation of the Final EA.
3 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day)	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	It is our position that to allow this project to proceed on the basis of post construction monitoring would be in violation of the current environmental laws	The Draft EA has been reviewed by several agencies in both the provincial and federal governments, and the Final EA will be reviewed by these same agencies. The Project will comply with several pieces of federal and provincial legislation – please refer to Technical Appendix F (Legislation Background).
4 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	Reviewed the Executive Summary and Appendix including bird studies for the project.	We are assuming that this means that Technical Appendix C5 (Bird Report) was the singular component of the Draft EA that was reviewed.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	Avian studies over the two year period involve 34 days of fieldwork. This time in the field is totally inadequate to characterize the avifauna at risk over such a large area	Please note that a minimum of two observers were actively surveying on most field days, often covering different parts of the study area. Four observers were engaged in simultaneous surveys on each of the ten winter raptor survey days. The bird monitoring program was developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and MNR. Dates were selected to ensure the most appropriate coverage of each species group during their peak activity periods. The revised Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA report on additional surveys carried out in summer, 2007 (representing an additional 10 survey days [20 person-days]). Ongoing surveys conducted in fall 2007, intended to supplement baseline information, will be released under separate cover.
6 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	The inclusion of studies citations from other areas and general suggestions that turbines are only a minor problem for birds is irrelevant – wind power is new technology in North America, and we are still learning about problems and benefits.	The Final EA and Technical Appendix C5 have been revised to reflect the results of more recent mortality studies, and to note the specific characteristics of the Wolfe Island site.
7 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	Each proposed industrial turbine complex site must be carefully assessed on its own merits as potential impacts vary greatly from area to area.	Agreed.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
8 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	Cannot understand how species were assigned risk levels. Appears arbitrary as other species exhibit similar behaviours at those with high risk. Also, many species are at risk of serious habitat alteration from the project.	Bird mortality at wind facilities varies according to the species or species group. Sections 7.9 (addressing birds) and 7.10 (addressing species at risk) outline the potential effects and some methods by which the adverse effects will be minimized. Sections 7.9 and 7.10 rated the significance of net effects as low (for birds) and moderate (for species at risk). Please refer to these sections of the Final EA for a discussion of the reasons for the ratings.
9 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	To adequately address potential impacts on wintering raptors, migrant raptor, nocturnal migrant songbirds, waterbird and waterfowl concentrations, nesting and migrant declining grassland birds, require a minimum of 3-5 years of study at an intensity level far greater than efforts to date.	The bird monitoring program was developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and MNR. Dates were selected to ensure the most appropriate coverage of each species group during their peak activity periods. The revised Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA report on additional surveys carried out in spring and summer, 2007. Ongoing surveys conducted in fall 2007, intended to supplement baseline information, will be released under separate cover.
10 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	Based on the inadequacy of pre-construction studies to date, assuming that post-construction studies will solve any severe problems is highly questionable. Also, if post-construction studies are conducted at the level of the pre-construction studies done to date, it is highly unlikely any problems would be detected even if they exist.	The projected effects will be the subject of a thorough post-construction monitoring program, to be developed in collaboration with EC/CWS and MNR. Any unanticipated effects will be addressed through the “adaptive management” portion of the post-construction monitoring agreement.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
11 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	To get any sense of general raptor migration patterns and species use, daily counts must be conducted for several seasons. To suggest based on limited study time spent on Wolfe Island that no significant migration crosses the island is not credible. Detailed studies are needed over several years to assess risk to these species.	No evidence of significant raptor migration was reported in any of the background sources reviewed. Surveys conducted for migrating raptors in fall 2007, intended to supplement baseline information, will be released under separate cover.
12 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	Breeding bird survey data collected are totally inadequate in both quantity and quality. The number of sample points spread over such a large area and sampled an insufficient number of times.	Additional breeding bird surveys were conducted in 2007 and the results summarized in Technical Appendix C5. Consultation with MNR resulted in the addition of 14 point counts, concentrated in areas of higher turbine density and in wetlands. The survey frequency is consistent with several monitoring schemes for territorial birds, including the Atlas of the Breeding Birds of Ontario, Ontario's Forest Bird Monitoring Program, and the continent-wide Breeding Bird Survey, as well as Environment Canada's recommended protocols.
13 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	Not an expert on bats, but prudence would dictate that long-term (minimum 3-5 year) studies of bats, threatened and endangered birds, bird and bat migration be conducted.	In response to concerns about bats, CREC commissioned a radar-acoustic study of bats and nocturnally migrating birds in fall 2007 to supplement baseline data. Results will be provided under separate cover. These studies have been designed to meet the MNR's recommended guidelines for bat surveys (August, 2007).

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
14 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	Potential grassland habitat fragmentation by turbines and access roads is of great concern in addition to potential direct mortality.	This potential effect is noted in Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA.
15 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	The studies to date barely acknowledge some potential problems and do not adequately address the potential for serious disruption of raptors and other open country species.	Published and unpublished studies of the direct and indirect effects of wind turbines on birds at operating wind power facilities were reviewed and considered in assessing potential effects for the project. Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA indicate that little information exists to assess the degree of effect. The projected effects will be the subject of a thorough post-construction monitoring program, to be developed in collaboration with EC/CWS and MNR. Any unanticipated effects will be addressed through the "adaptive management" portion of the post-construction monitoring agreement.
16 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada cc: Project webmail	25 June 2007	Since many of the species involved are highly migratory, your responsibility transcends the boundaries of Wolfe Island and has direct consequences for all citizens of the Americas.	This comment is directed at Environment Canada. CREC is unable to respond on behalf of the agency.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
17 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada K. Griffiths, Ministry of Natural Resources Project webmail	28 August 2007	Attached, please find an interim bird report prepared by Mr. Gerry Smith. Mr. Smith is currently conducting an impact assessment of the proposed site plan, as outlined in the draft ERR, on behalf of Dr. Day and Ms. McDermott. We will continue to forward his observations and recommendations as they are received.	No response necessary.
18 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada K. Griffiths, Ministry of Natural Resources Project webmail	28 August 2007	The primary purpose of this trip was to look at turbine sites and assess options so the birds observed were an added bonus.	No response necessary.
19 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada K. Griffiths, Ministry of Natural Resources Project webmail	28 August 2007	Observed a flock of 12 American Golden Plover. Review of area strongly suggests this species and other grassland shorebirds such as Buff-breasted Sandpiper must be of concern related to proposed project. Extensive mixed open habitat on WI appears ideal for these species and I suspect more intensive fieldwork would detect substantial use during period late July - October	Background information sources do not identify important shorebird staging habitat on upland portions of the Wolfe Island study area. Small numbers of Black-bellied Plover, Killdeer and yellowlegs species were observed during thorough, weekly field visits for foraging waterfowl in September and October, 2007. Substantial use of the study area by grassland shorebirds was not detected during these surveys.
20 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada K. Griffiths, Ministry of Natural Resources Project webmail	28 August 2007	Grassland songbird species such as Bobolink and Eastern Kingbird were present in high numbers. Count of 163 Eastern Kingbird is one of highest I have ever seen in northeastern Lake Ontario region and emphasizes importance of WI to a wide variety of open country birds.	Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 identify the importance of Wolfe Island for open country birds. Area searches in high quality grassland habitat were conducted in June, 2007 and the results are included in the revised Technical Appendix C5.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
21 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada K. Griffiths, Ministry of Natural Resources Project webmail	28 August 2007	Raptor fauna present was diverse and numbers excellent for mid-August. It could be a good winter if *microtus* numbers are high.	No response necessary.
22 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada K. Griffiths, Ministry of Natural Resources Project webmail	28 August 2007	Raptors observed include: Osprey 3, Sharp-shinned Hawk 3, Northern Harrier 18 (primarily juveniles hatched this year), Red-tailed hawk 16 (primarily juveniles hatched this year), American Kestrel 19. Total of 53 grassland-associated raptors is probably good for this time of season	No response necessary.
1 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environnent Canada Project webmail	31 July 2007	Purpose of letter is to express great concern regarding potential ecological impacts of proposed wind project. Respectfully but strongly urge you to submit this proposed project to highest degree of scrutiny related to potential adverse impacts on migratory birds and bats. Feel oversight for a project with great potential for adverse environmental impacts has not been adequate.	This comment is directed at the CEA Agency. CREC is unable to respond on behalf of the agency.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
2 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environnent Canada Project webmail	31 July 2007	Recently conducted a detailed survey of grassland raptors in Cape Vincent – study is related to a proposed wind turbine complex at that location. Effort further reinforced concerns regarding impacts of such projects on grassland raptors from both a direct mortality and habitat disruption standpoint.	These potential effects are noted in Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA.
3 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environnent Canada Project webmail	31 July 2007	Impact assessments presented by project proponents in both Cape Vincent and WI are totally inadequate in addressing potential impacts of these projects and much greater consideration is needed.	The bird monitoring program was developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and MNR. Published and unpublished studies of the direct and indirect effects of wind turbines on birds at operating wind power facilities were reviewed and considered in assessing potential effects for the project. Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA indicate that little information exists to assess the degree of effect. The projected effects will be the subject of a thorough post-construction monitoring program, to be developed in collaboration with EC/CWS and MNR. Any unanticipated effects will be addressed through the "adaptive management" portion of the post-construction monitoring agreement.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
4 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environnent Canada Project webmail	31 July 2007	US authorities have commented on the total lack of adequate studies in Cape Vincent, and hopefully you likewise will require much more detailed effort prior to any construction I find all other aspects of the studies to date with reference to migratory birds insufficient and request that much more detailed assessments be conducted	This comment is directed at the CEA Agency. CREC is unable to respond on behalf of the agency.
5 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environnent Canada Project webmail	31 July 2007	Particularly glaring omission is lack of radar and acoustic studies related to nocturnal bird migration. One need only to glance at the map of proposed turbine sites to note high density near western end of the island close to Lake Ontario. Such a concentration close to shoreline of a great lake is extremely problematic since bird migration concentrations along great lakehores are well documented – to propose such concentrations without doing complete studies of nocturnal migration through the area is highly questionable	The bird monitoring program was developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and MNR. EC's Monitoring Protocols suggest that radar is not generally required for monitoring unless there are particular risk factors involved, such as a suspected migration corridor for birds, concerns about particular Species at Risk, or concerns about waterbird movements at proposed offshore installations. EC has commented that "nocturnal migrants tend to move along broad fronts and there is no evidence to suggest that the area around Wolfe Island functions as a 'funnel' for migrants." Please see Appendix G8 of the Final EA for their comments. In response to concerns about bats, CREC commissioned a radar-acoustic study of bats and nocturnally migrating birds in fall 2007 to supplement baseline data. Results will be provided under separate cover.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
6 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environnent Canada Project webmail	31 July 2007	Due to ecological variability from year to year (raptor numbers and use of areas vary due to natural cycles) adequate studies require sufficient fieldwork over several years.	The well-documented fluctuations in species presence and numbers are available from background information, and specific information regarding habitat utilization was collected during the entire period of particularly high raptor numbers during the winter of 2006/2007. Please note that Environment Canada participated in one of the 2007 surveys conducted by Stantec and concluded that "in our opinion, the number of surveys conducted provide a good index of wintering bird abundance and patterns" (letter, September 21, 2007, p. 8).
7 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environnent Canada Project webmail	31 July 2007	As noted in my letter of 16 July, amount of fieldwork conducted to date is inadequate to assess island's' avifauna and address general mitigation options, let alone assess potential impacts on turbine-by-turbine basis. Such assessments are essential to attempt to mitigate impacts to any great degree For example, species of wetlands such as rails and small herons including Least Bittern may use grassy and wet hayfields for distances up to .8 – 1.6 km from the wetlands Site by site assessment of the potential impacts of a given turbine are needed	Please note that a minimum of two observers were actively surveying on most field days, often covering different parts of the study area. Four observers were engaged in simultaneous surveys on each of the ten winter raptor survey days. The bird monitoring program was developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and MNR. Dates were selected to ensure the most appropriate coverage of each species group during their peak activity periods. The revised Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA report on additional surveys carried out in spring and summer, 2007 (representing an additional 23 survey days [46 person-days]). Ongoing surveys conducted in fall 2007, intended to supplement baseline information, will be released under separate cover.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
8 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environnent Canada Project webmail	31 July 2007	Nature is dynamic and events often occur that were not even to be considered two years ago but are now very relevant to potential impacts of this project. When I wrote my letter of 16 July 2007, I was unaware that the following was occurring again in 2007 – in 2006 and this year, development of type e botulism, resulting from introduction of invasive species in Lake Ontario is having devastating impacts on a number of fish eating water birds and waterfowl. Species of limited local distribution, such as the Caspian Tern, are being severely impacted with deaths by hundreds. This species, while note currently listed, could be potentially listed in New York if these losses continue. Colony on Little Galloo Island harbors a large percentage of the Caspian Terns breeding on Lake Ontario. These birds feed extensively around WI and regularly fly across it as well as other areas in the western St. Lawrence. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Biologists has told me that most dead Caspian Terns are occurring in New York Waters of Lake Ontario so perhaps the botulism matter is less severe in western St. Lawrence?	No response necessary.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
9 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environnent Canada Project webmail	31 July 2007	Potential for any turbine impacts on this and other waterfowl and water bird species needs further careful consideration	Potential effects are discussed in Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA.
10 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from G. Smith	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environnent Canada Project webmail	31 July 2007	I urge you to not issue positive decision on this Project but instead require further review in an extended time frame that allows for adequate consideration of impacts. Such consideration may permit adequate mitigation that at the very least will improve the project and reduce impacts. Critical migratory bird resources of international importance pass through the northeastern Lake Ontario-St. Lawrence region and their well-being must be part of the consideration of any large scale project. When large concentrations of wintering raptors and declining grassland-breeding birds are added to the equation great caution becomes even more critical to protection of these species	This comment is directed at the CEA Agency. CREC is unable to respond on behalf of the agency.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Eliot, Smith Barristers & Solicitors (representing J. Day, S. McDermott, and WIRE)				
1 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day, S. McDermott and WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	26 June 2007	As we have not heard directly from the CEAA, we are directing this letter to you, and asking you to forward it to the appropriate body. We are still concerned about the lack of transparency surrounding the statement in the Draft ERR released by the proponent for the Wolfe Island Wind Farm with respect to the compliance with the Federal EA process.	Stantec replied to all parties on 29 June 2007, and forwarded comments to Darla Cameron at the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency. As has been done throughout the study, CREC will continue to consult with federal departments and will work to ensure the EA meets the requirements of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
2 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day, S. McDermott and WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	26 June 2007	CREC has requested and obtained the planning permits prior to and without any public debate	The details related to the passing of the Zoning By-law amendment are under municipal jurisdiction and this amendment is part of the planning process. Disputes regarding the Zoning By-law have been resolved at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing in July 2007.
3 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day, S. McDermott and WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian	26 June 2007	There is a hearing scheduled at the OMB on the failure of proper notice and public debate on the scope and siting of the project. There have been over 200 signatures collected requesting that our council reconsider the bylaw – their position is that their 'hands are tied'. They have placed a holding pattern on the zoning area, conditional only on the production of an EA. They refuse to respond to any inquiries about environmental issues, advising that those issues are now in the hands of the province.	Please see response to Comment #2.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
	Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment			
4 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day, S. McDermott and WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	26 June 2007	At the public meeting regarding the zoning bylaws a question was asked why the meeting was held without the ESR, the proponent said they would not have proceeded in that way unless they were sure the ESR would be approved.	Please see response to Comment #2. Please note that approval of the EA is not determined by the proponent.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day, S. McDermott and WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	26 June 2007	Proponent has also made public their purchase of a multi million dollar cable for the transmission line – clearly an effort to demonstrate that the project was a done deal. There are several properties on WI where work is being made in preparation for project access roads	The submarine cable was required to be purchased in advance to meet the current construction schedule. Purchase of the cable is a financial risk that belongs wholly to CREC and in no way guarantees approval of the Project. There are no construction activities underway for the Project. CREC cannot begin construction until the appropriate permits and approvals have been obtained.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
6 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day, S. McDermott and WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	26 June 2007	At no time before the release of the DRAFT EA was the public informed of the importance of the island as an IBA	Wolfe Island's status as an Important Bird Area ("IBA") was mentioned in the Environmental Overview Report (released March 2006), in responses to individual stakeholder concerns, during discussions at Public Open Houses, and in the Draft EA.
7 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day, S. McDermott and WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian	26 June 2007	Public was not involved or invited to participate in the bird studies or sightings.	Trained field staff following Environment Canada-approved protocols conducted field surveys. However, wildlife observations submitted by local birders to the project team throughout the Project were also considered during data analysis and report writing.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
	Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment			
8 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day, S. McDermott and WIRE)	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	26 June 2007	We would expect the responsible ministry to commence a process that provides for full rights of public participation and an opportunity to request an elevation.	The provincial EA process provides many opportunities for public consultation as well as the opportunity to request an elevation. During the formal 30 Notice of Completion review and comment period, if the public is not satisfied with the level of information provided within the report or they question the conclusions, the public is able to request to the MOE to elevate the Project.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
9 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day, S. McDermott, and WIRE)	Email to: K. Hearne, Stantec cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency S. Allan, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	03 July 2007	In response to Stantec email sent 29 June 2007 to Darla Cameron. It is our position that the proponent of this project cannot unilateraly convert a prononent driven ERR, developed to comply with the provincial requirements, to a federal EA.	Although a Federal EA is not a proponent driven process, it is up to the proponent to supply key information to the appropriate federal authorities, such as a project description and screening report. Recent initiatives in Ontario and other jurisdictions have resulted in improved coordination between federal and provincial processes while fulfilling applicable legislative requirements of all parties. The project has been harmonized to meet the requirements of both the federal and provincial requirements In Stantec's opinion, this approach is the most comprehensive and strategic way to conduct an EA
9 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day, S. McDermott, and WIRE)	Email to: K. Hearne, Stantec cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency S. Allan, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada	03 July 2007	The Federal EA must be initiated and lead by the appropriate responsible federal agency, which clearly is not the proponent of the project.	It is reasonably assumed that the Responsible Authority for the Project will fulfill their obligations under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
	J. Fisher, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency			
9 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day, S. McDermott, and WIRE)	Email to: K. Hearne, Stantec cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency S. Allan, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	03 July 2007	The scope of this project and the public interest in the ultimate impact on many environmental issues have not yet been accorded due process under the applicable legislation.	EA approval rests provincially with the MOE, and federally with the Responsible Authority. Both agencies will have received many comments from other expert and regulatory agencies on the EA for the Project.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
9 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day, S. McDermott, and WIRE)	Email to: K. Hearne, Stantec cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency S. Allan, Environment Canada L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	03 July 2007	As per your correspondence to Ms. Cameron, we are waiting for her office to clarify the federal government's position on this matter prior to taking further action	No response necessary.
James Day				
1 James Day	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment	26 June 2007	The bird report is seriously flawed, with totally inadequate observations and conclusions	We appreciate your comment; however detail regarding which issues you feel are seriously flawed would be helpful and would allow us to better address your concerns.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
	Canada D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment			
2 James Day	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	26 June 2007	Observers spent minimal amounts of time and have produced a report justifying action on no acceptable data	Please note that a minimum of two observers were actively surveying on most field days, often covering different parts of the study area. Four observers were engaged in simultaneous surveys on each of the ten winter raptor survey days. The bird monitoring program was developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and MNR. Dates were selected to ensure the most appropriate coverage of each species group during their peak activity periods. The revised Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA report on additional surveys carried out in spring and summer, 2007 (representing an additional 23 survey days [46 person-days]). Ongoing surveys conducted in fall 2007, intended to supplement baseline information, will be released under separate cover.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
3 James Day	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	26 June 2007	Report ignored factual documented reports previously submitted	We appreciate your comment; however detail regarding which documents you feel have been omitted would be helpful and would allow us to better address your concerns.
4 James Day	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian	26 June 2007	No indication of time of day when these observations were made nor the weather at the time	Technical Appendix C5 of both the Draft EA and Final EA list the time of day and weather conditions of each survey.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
	Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment			
5 James Day	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	26 June 2007	There is so little relevant information, including a proper inventory of nesting birds, or seasonal behavior of all species	The bird monitoring program was developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and MNR. Dates were selected to ensure the most appropriate coverage of each species group during their peak activity periods. Protocols were consistent with several monitoring schemes for breeding birds, including the Atlas of the Breeding Birds of Ontario, Ontario's Forest Bird Monitoring Program, and the continent-wide Breeding Bird Survey, as well as Environment Canada's recommended protocols. The revised Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA report on additional surveys carried out in spring and summer, 2007. Ongoing surveys conducted in fall 2007, intended to supplement baseline information, will be released under separate cover.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
6 James Day	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	26 June 2007	May lead to another Altamont Wind Project	There are significant differences between these two projects. The Altamont project consists of over 6,000 turbines in a mountain pass, and is the largest concentration of wind turbines in the world. .
7 James Day	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada cc. Project webmail L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada D. Cameron, Canadian	26 June 2007	Has been estimated that each tower will be within 500 meters of each other. This is clearly unacceptable on such a species important bird habitat especially the endangered raptors and field nesters, let alone thousands of waterfowl which concentrate in this region	Turbines are scattered across the study area with variable spacing. We appreciate your comment; however more detail regarding the reasons you feel this is unacceptable would be helpful and would allow us to better address your concerns.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
	Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency R. Read, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment			
Eliot, Smith Barristers & Solicitors (representing J. Day) – comments from William Evans				
1 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from W. Evans	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	28 June 2007	Please find attached the CV and comments from William Evans in regard to the sufficiency of the bird studies and conclusions reached by Stantec in the draft ERR for the Wolfe Island Wind Project.	No response necessary.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
2 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from W. Evans	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	28 June 2007	The lack of any research toward understanding and mitigating the impact to nocturnal migrants (e.g., songbirds) stands out as a serious omission from the Bird Report (Appendix C5).	The bird monitoring program was developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and MNR. EC's Monitoring Protocols suggest that radar is not generally required for monitoring unless there are particular risk factors involved, such as a suspected migration corridor for birds, concerns about particular Species at Risk, or concerns about waterbird movements at proposed offshore installations. EC has commented that "nocturnal migrants tend to move along broad fronts and there is no evidence to suggest that the area around Wolfe Island functions as a 'funnel' for migrants." Please see Appendix G8 of the Final EA for their comments.
3 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from W. Evans	Email to Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency L. Friesen, Environment Canada	28 June 2007	At the time the Bird Report was published (April 2007) there were few avian mortality studies in eastern North America from which to draw any regional conclusions on avian mortality from modern wind turbines (> 100 m height). Two of these are the Mountaineer Wind Project in northern West Virginia and the Buffalo Mountain, Tennessee study. Both these are inland wind projects in the Appalachian Mountains, more than 1000 km to the south of Wolfe Island.	Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA have been revised to reflect the results of more recent mortality studies. We note that mortality at sites in forested ridge top habitat, such as the sites listed, is elevated relative to that at other landscapes (Arnett et al., 2007). The forested ridge landscape is very different from the landscape and site characteristics of the Project site.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
	J. Fisher, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment		Since publication, mortality data from a new wind project has become available. The Maple Ridge wind project (195 turbines) is only about 70 km southeast of Wolfe Island and a three-year mortality study began in summer 2006.	
4 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from W. Evans	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	28 June 2007	While the EchoTrack study you cite does indicate that some birds avoid turbines, one must ultimately still realize and consider that avian mortality does still occur at wind projects.	Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA indicate that there is the potential for mortality for nocturnal migrants and other groups of birds.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from W. Evans	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	28 June 2007	Wolfe Island, due to its proximity to major water bodies, has a high incidence of low cloud and foggy conditions, which will limit avian avoidance capability and which are will exacerbate bird mortality compared to inland sites without such weather conditions. Factoring in West Virginia mortality study, and Cape Vincent radar study, and WI weather conditions, concludes that bird and bat mortality could be even higher than Maple Ridge	A recent literature review acknowledges that inclement weather is a contributing factor in avian collisions (Arnett et al., 2007), however, a recent study along the Ontario Great Lakes shoreline indicates that inclement weather resulted in a significant reduction in the flight density (number of birds and bats in flight) (EchoTrack, unpublished). The projected effects will be the subject of a thorough post-construction monitoring program, to be developed in collaboration with EC/CWS and MNR. Any unanticipated effects will be addressed through the “adaptive management” portion of the post-construction monitoring agreement.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
6 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from W. Evans	Email to: Project webmail cc. D. Cameron, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency D. Damman, for the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency L. Friesen, Environment Canada J. Fisher, Environment Canada R. Read, Environment Canada S. Allan, Environment Canada V. Mitchell, Ministry of the Environment	28 June 2007	I strongly suggest that at least a one-year radar study be conducted on Wolfe Island prior to considering construction in order to verify whether abnormally high nocturnal rates of passage below turbine height might exist and to document any migration channeling dynamics on the island.	The bird monitoring program was developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and MNR. EC's Monitoring Protocols suggest that radar is not generally required for monitoring unless there are particular risk factors involved, such as a suspected migration corridor for birds, concerns about particular Species at Risk, or concerns about waterbird movements at proposed offshore installations. EC has commented that "nocturnal migrants tend to move along broad fronts and there is no evidence to suggest that the area around Wolfe Island functions as a 'funnel' for migrants." Please see Appendix G8 of the Final EA for their comments. In response to concerns about bats, CREC commissioned a radar-acoustic study of bats and nocturnally migrating birds in fall 2007 to supplement baseline data. Results will be provided under separate cover.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
1 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Bill Evans	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Enviornment Canada T., R. Sullivan, US Fish and Wildlife Service A. Hoar, US Fish and Wildlife Service Project Webmail	31 July 2007	Expert on nocturnal bird migration. Was slated to appear as a witness at the OMB hearing, ended up not testifying as the Township and proponent argued that such issues would be dealt with through the environmental appeal process.	No response necessary.
2 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Bill Evans	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Enviornment Canada T., R. Sullivan, US Fish and Wildlife Service A. Hoar, US Fish and Wildlife Service Project Webmail	31 July 2007	In the agreement that came out of the hearing, the Township and proponent argued it was the Canadian Government's role to make changes in the assessment and mitigation of environmental issues.	No response necessary.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
3 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Bill Evans	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Enviornment Canada T., R. Sullivan, US Fish and Wildlife Service A. Hoar, US Fish and Wildlife Service Project Webmail	31 July 2007	Writing with concerns for the Project. We in the US are watching WIWP out of concern for raptors and nocturnal migrant impacts as well as any precedent the project may set for wind project development along the Lake Ontario shoreline region.	No response necessary.
4 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Bill Evans	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Enviornment Canada T., R. Sullivan, US Fish and Wildlife Service A. Hoar, US Fish and Wildlife Service Project Webmail	31 July 2007	Preconstruction studies are grossly insufficient for a project in a criteria nexus for raptors and nocturnal migrants. These studies do not match the level of preconstruction understanding that is being sought at US projects.	The bird monitoring program was developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and MNR and are consistent with EC's recommended protocols.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Bill Evans	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Enviornment Canada T., R. Sullivan, US Fish and Wildlife Service A. Hoar, US Fish and Wildlife Service Project Webmail	31 July 2007	Foremost is lack of any research on impact of the project on night migrating birds and bats. Would urge coordination between Canadian and US Governments on the environmental impact of wind energy on the Great Lakes.	EC's Monitoring Protocols suggest that radar is not generally required for monitoring unless there are particular risk factors involved, such as a suspected migration corridor for birds, concerns about particular Species at Risk, or concerns about waterbird movements at proposed offshore installations. EC has commented that "nocturnal migrants tend to move along broad fronts and there is no evidence to suggest that the area around Wolfe Island functions as a 'funnel' for migrants." Please see Appendix G8 of the Final EA for their comments.
6 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Bill Evans	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Enviornment Canada T., R. Sullivan, US Fish and Wildlife Service A. Hoar, US Fish and Wildlife Service Project Webmail	31 July 2007	Will be carrying out a study on nocturnal migration on WI this fall in association with similar studies in Cape Vincent, at the Maple Ridge wind farm.	No response necessary.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
7 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Bill Evans	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Enviornment Canada T., R. Sullivan, US Fish and Wildlife Service A. Hoar, US Fish and Wildlife Service Project Webmail	31 July 2007	The latter wind project is the largest built in the eastern US – much understanding will be gained from my study regarding the potential impact of a wind project on WI to night migrating birds.	We would welcome the opportunity to review the results of your study, although we note that mortality at sites in forested ridge top habitat, such as the Maple Ridge site, is elevated relative to that at other landscapes (Arnett et al., 2007). The Maple Ridge forested ridge landscape is very different from the landscape and site characteristics of the Project site.
8 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Bill Evans	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Enviornment Canada T., R. Sullivan, US Fish and Wildlife Service A. Hoar, US Fish and Wildlife Service Project Webmail	31 July 2007	Urge the WIWP not be permitted until studies such as this are completed and reviewed for their information	This comment is directed at the CEA Agency. CREC is unable to respond on behalf of the agency.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Eliot, Smith Barristers & Solicitors (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Barrie Gilbert				
1 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Ontario guidelines point out that minimizing biological impacts depends on appropriate site location for turbines; however, site selection was made before the DRAFT ERR was completed.	Although the report was not completed, the majority of information was available to CREC during the siting process – setbacks and constraints were already established. In addition, site selection took into account agency and public feedback received during the EA process.
2 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Biological sampling was superficial and unable to define flight paths and concentrations.	A multi-year bird monitoring program has been developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and the MNR. Multi-year studies conducted for the project include: habitat surveys, wintering raptors, spring waterfowl, spring raptor and passerine migration, fall waterfowl, fall raptor and passerine migration, breeding birds, and species at risk and focused on identifying areas of high use or areas of importance. Areas of concentrated raptor and Short-eared Owl use was mapped in Technical Appendix C5. EC has commented that “nocturnal migrants tend to move along broad fronts and there is no evidence to suggest that the area around Wolfe Island functions as a ‘funnel’ for migrants.” Please see Appendix G8 of the Final EA for their comments.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
3 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Title "Environmental Review" is misleading, this suggests there is a review, a summary of scientific studies, field reports, data or analysis of potential impacts. This has not been accomplished in the ERR.	The title of the EA report is dictated by provincial and federal reporting requirements (in this case Ontario Regulation 116/01).
4 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	ERR has failed to adequately assess the wildlife and aquatic resources, habitats and species that constitute the ecosystem.	Wildlife, habitat and aquatic resources on Wolfe Island and the Kingston mainland are discussed in Technical Appendix C7, and aquatic resources in the Lower Gap are discussed extensively in Technical Appendix C10. Habitats and communities of herpetiles, birds, butterflies and bats were the subject of Technical Appendices C2, C5, C8, and C9, respectively. Potential effects on surface water and aquatic habitats are examined in Section 7.3 of the Final EA. Potential effects on terrestrial wildlife and habitats are examined in Section 7.8 of the Final EA. Potential effects on birds and their habitats are examined in Section 7.9 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	There are major inadequacies relating to internationally significant bird populations, estimates of their numbers by season, habitats, seasonal timing of habitat occupation, daily flight paths	A multi-year bird monitoring program has been developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and the MNR. Multi-year studies conducted for the project include: habitat surveys, wintering raptors, spring waterfowl, spring raptor and passerine migration, fall waterfowl, fall raptor and passerine migration, breeding birds, and species at risk and focused on identifying areas of high use or areas of importance. Additional surveys conducted in spring and summer 2007 have been considered in preparation of the Final EA.
6 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	ERR is deficient in predicting collision mortality, direct disturbance (alienation from use of typical foraging habitats) or habitat degradation. Relatively few days of monitoring of bird species is unacceptable in the race to avert extinction of meadow-dwelling bird species, as their habitat is represented on the island.	These potential impacts are noted in Technical Appendix C5 and Sections 7.8-7.10 of the Final EA. Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA acknowledge the importance of grassland bird habitat on Wolfe Island.
7 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Void of data for a host of other vertebrate species (bats, snakes, turtles) gives impression of minimal interest and low priority to living systems	Habitats and communities of herpetiles and bats were the subject of Technical Appendices C2 and C9, respectively. Additional observations made in spring and summer 2007 have been considered in preparation of the Final EA. In response to concerns about bats, CREC commissioned a radar-acoustic study of bats and nocturnally migrating birds in fall 2007 to supplement baseline data. Results will be provided under separate cover.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
8 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	What species of concern are represented in sites proposed for turbines and construction activities – ERR had no habitat analysis or maps of habitat types that would be essential for selecting turbine sites to minimize impacts on critical habitats should they exist.	Technical Appendix C5 of both the Draft EA and Final EA contained maps showing the locations of concentrations of wintering raptors and Short-eared Owls. The revised Technical Appendix C5 for the Final EA also included an analysis and maps of potential Short-eared Owl and Henslow's Sparrow breeding habitat, which were surveyed in 2007.
9 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	What is total meadow and cropland acreage estimated to be included in crane maneuvering and transit between turbine sites – ERR provides footprint of turbine foundation, but a much larger area will be destroyed.	Please refer to Section 2.5.5.7 of the Draft EA. This section, in part, provides the typical land base required for a wind turbine on a 100 acre lot, and also provides the calculated average land base required per turbine based on the project layout presented in the Draft EA.
10 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Turtle and snake species at risk of being crushed by vehicles during construction phase – ERR does not state how many vehicle trips and kilometers driven the proposed Project will require during the 5 year construction period. This effect cannot be considered short term and spatially limited, as ERR says.	The construction period does not take 5 years. We are unaware of any recognized mitigation measures available to ensure turtles and snakes are not crossing roadways while traffic including construction traffic is using the area. In Section 7.15.3.1 of the EA, it is stated that additional mitigation measures during construction, among others, include ensuring all contractor employees adhere to local speed limits, traffic signage, and utilize safe defensive driving practices.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
11 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	What animal species are present or absent in the areas of proposed Project structures and associated activities? Until studies (such as field sampling on site, systematic sampling for collection of quantitative data collected on temporal and spatial protocols) are completed and evaluated, decisions to proceed with the Project would appear to contravene established provincial and federal guidelines for assessing impacts of wind power utilities	A multi-year bird monitoring program has been developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and the MNR and is consistent with EC's recommended survey protocols for assessing the impacts of wind power facilities. Surveys for other species were conducted according to available survey protocols (e.g. EC's Amphibian Call Counts and Bird Studies Canada's Marsh Monitoring program). Mitigation measures are designed to be applied effectively at all turbine locations to ensure the potential effect to animals is minimized.
12 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	What are baseline patterns, both daily and seasonal of waterfowl? There would appear to be a high level or risk of collision with turbines as they move between wetlands. ERR fails to present local flight corridors.	The revised Technical Appendix C5 of the Final EA includes the results of spring waterfowl surveys conducted in 2007, including diagrams of local flight paths. Results of ongoing fall 2007 waterfowl surveys will be submitted under separate cover.
13 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	The intensive fall hunt causes waterfowl to move more frequently than they otherwise would. Implication of displacement for collision mortality rates needs to be assessed.	Disruption of waterfowl staging and movement patterns as a result of hunting has been considered in Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
14 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	What are winter population estimates and distribution of resident and migratory raptors in the region of the WI project? Accurate assessment of raptor mortality would require field monitoring and assessment of raptor numbers over the rodent cycle. No quantitative data on numbers and behaviour of ecologically significant species has been presented in the ERR.	This information is provided in Technical Appendix C5 of both the Draft EA and Final EA.
15 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Where is information about effects of towers (radio, buildings, etc) on bird mortality in Ontario presented? I consider the estimate of 2 bird deaths per year per turbine as invalid since it extrapolates that rate from a region that does not have the high resident and migratory populations that are documented for WI	No wind plants have been constructed in areas similar to the Study Area. Environment Canada's "Wind Turbines and Birds: A Background Review for Environmental Assessment" (April, 2007) contains a current review of over 200 international studies, however, the accuracy of mortality rate estimates varies widely depending on study methodology and the application of correction factors. Accordingly, reference to the rate of mortality has been removed from Section 1.12.1.
16 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	What alternative areas or energy generation types (eg. run-of-river) have been explored? The ERR has not explained why it is logical or necessary to site a major wind energy industry over a landscape that is assigned a very high sensitivity status.	Wolfe Island has excellent wind resources, but poor topography for hydroelectric generation. CREC has signed a RES II contract for wind power at this location.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
17 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	As settlement and urban sprawl spreads across the region, conservation biology needs to increase for landscape corridors and connectedness.	The project will keep agricultural lands in use.
18 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Has the planning process of turbines site selection and ERR analysis violated provincial guidelines for protecting habitats? Refer to MNR document *Guidelines to Assist MNR staff in the review of wind power proposals: Potential impacts to birds and bird habitats*. Site selection preceded completion of the ERR, so appears there was no specific information available on bird habitats or activities to guide planning for appropriate site selection. If this is so, the environmental analysis could be considered invalid.	Please see response to Comment #1.
19 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail Letter addressed to: S. Allan, Environment Canada	29 June 2007	Believes the project contravenes provincial and federal laws and should be rejected for WI	The Draft EA has been reviewed by several agencies in both the provincial and federal governments, and the Final EA will be reviewed by these same agencies. The Project will comply with several pieces of federal and provincial legislation – please refer to Technical Appendix F (Legislation Background).

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
1 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail	31 July 2001	Have thoroughly reviewed the WIWP, and its ERR and have grave concerns about the proposed project's effects on migratory birds (waterfowl, shorebirds, larids, grassland species and raptors) and on mammals (especially bats), reptiles and amphibians. Some of these species are protected by international treaty, especially the Migratory Bird Convention Act and well-established legal protection under SARA and COSEWIC identification	Please see above responses to related, specific comments.
2 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail	31 July 2001	However, I have serious concerns that careful review and regulatory enforcement may fail to assess the ERR for the Wind Project that is currently moving forward due to current uncertainty about what agency or agencies are mandated as responsible for final decision-making	This comment is directed at the CEA Agency. CREC is unable to respond on behalf of the agency.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
3 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail	31 July 2001	It is unclear to me what provincial agency, if any, has line authority and responsibility to make a final decision on the adequacy of the ERR for this project. Furthermore, it is unclear how a provincial agency could be in a position to enforce adherence to an international bird conservation treaty.	The Ontario Ministry of the Environment will make the final decision on the adequacy of the ERR for this project, while considering the input of all the commenting agencies that may function in an advisory role.
4 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail	31 July 2001	I would request and be very grateful if you would confer with relevant agencies and provide me with a written response to these questions and concerns.	No response necessary.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail	31 July 2001	My current analysis suggests that the final review of the ERR may fall between the stools of responsibility. As I said this is of very grave concern to me in the face of current habitat loss in North America and the prospect of known increases in avian mortality that are sure to follow if this huge industrial energy facility is build over some of the most significant wildlife habitat in eastern Canada.	Please refer to Comment #3
6 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail	31 July 2001	Wish to advise you that I was to have appeared before OMB Hearing to give expert witness on the Project's impacts, but Township and proponent argued that those issues would all be dealt with through environmental appeal. In fact, the settlement recognized, and I am aware, that the township and proponent argued that the government could make changes if they were necessary, and it was not the township's role, and I noted above.	No response necessary.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
7 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail	31 July 2001	Settlement indicates “all parties agree that the assessment and mitigation of environmental issues is of paramount importance” I agree with this and would like you to assure me that government will formally evaluate the ERR and decide on its adequacy in view of the international recognition of the natural resources on WI, and the probability of cumulative environmental effects that can be expected from the combined impacts on birds of the proposed WI WP and three wind projects immediately adjacent in the Cape Vincent area of New York State	This comment is directed at the CEA Agency. CREC is unable to respond on behalf of the agency.
8 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail	31 July 2001	As regards to fish and aquatic habitat I believe the DFO should be involved as the transmission trunk line connection will have ice-hardened construction at both ends in large fish nursery and cyprinid habitat	This comment is directed at the CEA Agency. CREC is unable to respond on behalf of the agency.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
9 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail	31 July 2001	On the NW Sand Bay cable landing there is a small seasonal stream that drains a disposal site when the CIL Dupont Nylon plant (now "Invista) produced coat-derived plastics for decades, may be prudent for DFO to determine if bottom coring is called for since dredging or excavation may release toxic sediments into Lake Ontario upstream and just west of Kingston's intake and purification on King Street	CREC is aware of the presence of the closed industrial landfill on the mainland. Geotechnical investigations will include soil sampling and groundwater sampling (if encountered). Potential effects associated with the construction of the transmission line on this property is addressed in Section 7.19 of the Final EA.
10 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Gilbert	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project webmail	31 July 2001	By way of this letter, I am requesting public consultation on these issues and the opportunity to submit my findings on the ERR regarding limitations of the scientific design, inadequacy of the field monitoring and results as well as presenting a summary of my review of the rare, vulnerable, and endangered species and their habitats on WI that are at risk from this project	As detailed in Section 5.0 of the EA report, considerable consultation and communication with all stakeholders, including members of the public and government agencies has been ongoing throughout the entirety of the EA process. In addition to having the opportunity to comment on the Draft EA, the public now has the opportunity to submit comments on the final EA during the formal Notice of Completion 30 day review and comment period.
Barrie Gilbert				
1 Barrie Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail	29 June 2007	Provided same comments as those addressed to S. Allan, Environment Canada, with the following additions.	No response necessary.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
2 Barrie Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail	29 June 2007	ERR states that the land on which turbines are to be sited is rural and has been modified for agriculture thus little or no potential impact to birds or other vertebrates is anticipated. This is incorrect – much land is residential or has habitat for meadow birds.	Residential land is not being used to site turbines. The importance of agricultural land for birds has been identified in Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA.
3 Barrie Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail	29 June 2007	Meadows and reforested areas have very high populations of meadow voles because of the fallowing land. You need to take this into account in consideration of aggregations of raptors, like short-eared owls, snowy owls, etc.	The importance of the vole population for wintering raptors has been identified in Technical Appendix C5 of the Final EA.
4 Barrie Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail	29 June 2007	ERR should have land use maps that show the current vegetation and land use status. The present draft is both wrong, and so inadequate as to mislead the reader regarding potential for significant displacement of birds, bird strike mortality and degradation of critical habitat.	Ecological Land Classification (“ELC”) mapping is provided in the Natural Environment Report (Appendix C7). Potential effects are discussed in Technical Appendix C5 and Sections 7.8 and 7.9 of the Final EA.
5 Barrie Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail	14 August 2007	Found the following statement in WI ERR “All potential negative effects that could not be avoided by siting can be effectively mitigated using well-known and proven methods and technologies”. Please provide me with scientific literature source for ‘proven methods and technologies’ What are these mitigation techniques and where were they ‘proven’ Assume you can provide me with references to peer-reviewed experimental tests of these methods.	The majority of mitigation measures are standard practice during any type of construction. Mitigation during operation is based on CREC / Canadian Hydro Developers’ and the wind industry’s experience with operating wind plants.
6 Barrie Gilbert	Email to: Project webmail	14 August 2007	Minister of MNR, David Ramsay, informed me that you had received detailed comments from MNR staff on ERR, could you provide electronic copy of those comments?	Comments have been provided to the OMB appellants through their lawyer at Eliot, Smith Barristers & Solicitors. Since you’ve been retained through this group, we assume that information will be shared through them. All agency comments will be presented in the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Eliot, Smith Barristers & Solicitors (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) - comments from Marie-Anne Hudson				
1 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Marie-Anne Hudson	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. Eliot, Smith Barristers and Solicitors Barbara Frei Project webmail	31 July 2007	Was present at hearing on WI last week – thought I should add my voice to those expressing concerns regarding development	No response necessary.
2 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Marie-Anne Hudson	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. Eliot, Smith Barristers and Solicitors Barbara Frei Project webmail	31 July 2007	Currently working on PhD at McGill University looking on breeding bird community composition and reproductive success in urban green spaces in Montreal. Should clarify that I am not against wind turbines – a hearty supporter of alternative energy. However, after spending time on WI and viewing maps, felt it was my duty to send you a brief letter outlining my concerns with the Project	No response necessary.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
3 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Marie-Anne Hudson	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. Eliot, Smith Barristers and Solicitors Barbara Frei Project webmail	31 July 2007	Do not believe WI can support the proposed 86 wind turbines without gravely disturbing the breeding success of the Island's birds, and without interfering with avian migration	Published and unpublished studies of the direct and indirect effects of wind turbines on birds at operating wind power facilities were reviewed and considered in assessing potential effects for the project. Potential effects and their significance vary by species or species group, and are detailed in Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA. Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA indicate that little information exists to assess the degree of effect.
4 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Marie-Anne Hudson	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. Eliot, Smith Barristers and Solicitors Barbara Frei Project webmail	31 July 2007	Both WI and Amherst Island are known for overwintering raptor populations, and until studies are performed to determine how the construction of these turbines will affect the rodent population, and thus impact these raptors (or impact them directly) I think extreme caution should be used with regards to this development	Potential effects and their significance vary by species or species group, and for small mammals are discussed in Section 7.8 of the Final EA. The projected effects will be the subject of a thorough post-construction monitoring program, to be developed in collaboration with EC/CWS and MNR. Any unanticipated effects will be addressed through the "adaptive management" portion of the post-construction monitoring agreement.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
5 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Marie-Anne Hudson	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. Eliot, Smith Barristers and Solicitors Barbara Frei Project webmail	31 July 2007	Believe if this project is to proceed, that a much smaller number of turbines should be erected as a pilot project, and these should be closely monitored in order to see what possible impacts they might have on the ecosystem as a whole (and not just bird life), and thus what possible mitigation measures should be put in place to offset these effects. This pilot project is not only good use of the precautionary principle, but is also good science: we do not know the impact these turbines will have on WI	A pilot project with a few turbines would not be economical to construct on Wolfe Island. The EA Report assesses the potential effects of the currentlly planned Project.
6 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Marie-Anne Hudson	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. Eliot, Smith Barristers and Solicitors Barbara Frei Project webmail	31 July 2007	True, the Island is far from pristine; however, you would be hard-pressed to find such an abundance and diversity of bird species in an area so close to an urban centre anywhere else.	No response necessary.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
7 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Marie-Anne Hudson	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. Eliot, Smith Barristers and Solicitors Barbara Frei Project webmail	31 July 2007	This island is an important ecosystem, and, along with its sister islands and shorelines, is critical migratory stopover, breeding and overwintering habitat for a wide variety of birds.	The importance of the study area to birds is discussed in Technical Appendix C5 and Sections 7.9 and 7.10 of the Final EA.
8 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Marie-Anne Hudson	Email to: S. Allan, Environment Canada L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. Eliot, Smith Barristers and Solicitors Barbara Frei Project webmail	31 July 2007	Please do whatever is in your power to force the company to scale back, start smaller, and conscientiously examine the impact of their development – is time energy companies be forced to think about their ecological footprint	This comment is directed at the CEA Agency and Environment Canada. CREC is unable to respond on behalf of the agencies.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Eliot, Smith Barristers & Solicitors (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from Barbara Frei				
1 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Frei	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project Webmail	31 July 2007	Pursuing M.Sc. in Wildlife Biology at McGill. Feels that with insight of grassland birds in region, deep concern over the size and scope of the wind farm project. Was to appear at OMB hearing to giver expert witness on impact of project on grassland bird population. Township and proponent argued these issues, and those of other expert witnesses would all be dealt with through the environmental appeal.	No response necessary.
2 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Frei	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project Webmail	31 July 2007	In Ontario Landbird Conservation Plan, Wolfe Island is specifically outlined as an area that supports important breeding populations of grassland birds, as such, agricultural and native grassland should be maintained. Global population and its continuance for several grassland bird species is tied to the region of the lower Great Lakes and St. Lawrence.	The importance of Wolfe Island for grassland birds has been identified in Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA. Agricultural land uses will be maintained in the study area.
3 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Frei	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project Webmail	31 July 2007	Placement of large number of turbines in optimal grassland bird breeding habitat has possibility to at a minimum cause habitat degradation, loss of breeding density, and create edge effects in the area	These potential effects are noted in Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
4 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Frei	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project Webmail	31 July 2007	In some areas of dense turbine placement, there is a very likely possibility that habitat loss will ultimately occur creating large local declines of a number of grassland birds species	The total habitat loss from turbines and associated infrastructure is estimated at less than 1% of the Wolfe Island portion of the study area. Potential effects to grassland birds are discussed in Technical Appendix C5 and Section 7.9 of the Final EA.
5 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Frei	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project Webmail	31 July 2007	These synergistic and cumulative effects may prove devastating for entire western part of island and will as such be a blow to grassland bird populations both on the Island, and even northeastern North America	Cumulative effects to grassland birds are discussed in Section 8.0 of the Final EA.
6 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott) – comments from B. Frei	Email to: L. Knox, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada Project Webmail	31 July 2007	Would like to voice concern and request public consultation on this matter, hope to have opportunity to make submissions on my concerns	As detailed in Section 5.0 of the EA report, considerable consultation and communication with all stakeholders, including members of the public and government agencies has been ongoing throughout the entirety of the EA process. In addition to having the opportunity to comment on the Draft EA, the public now has the opportunity to submit comments on the final EA during the formal Notice of Completion 30 day review and comment period.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
Eliot, Smith Barristers & Solicitors (representing J. Day and S. McDermott)				
1 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott)	Email to: Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada S. Colman, Ministry of Natural Resources	1 August 2007	Writing further to the recent OMB hearing, where all parties agreed that the ERR would be reviewed to ensure compliance with the PPS on Natural Heritage Features	No response necessary.
2 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott)	Email to: Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada S. Colman, Ministry of Natural Resources	1 August 2007	Remains our opinion that the designation of WI as an IBA of global and continental importance, and as a level 4 area of concern by Environment Canada, as well as specific references to the importance of WI for migratory birds in the PPS itself, support our view that WI is an area of significant Wildlife Habitat under the PPS. As all parties agreed that the ERR would be reviewed by outside agencies, that would be required to ensure compliance with the PPS, we wish to highlight the following concerns	A discussion of significant wildlife habitat, as defined by the MNR's Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide, has been added to Section 7.9.4 of the Final EA.
3 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott)	Email to: Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada S. Colman, Ministry of Natural Resources	1 August 2007	Questions decision to site towers within 2 km of the south shore of the Island, which seems to be in direct conflict with the suggestions and requirements of the PPS	We appreciate your comment; however more information on which PPS requirement is not being met would be helpful and would allow us to better address your concerns.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
4 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott)	Email to: Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada S. Colman, Ministry of Natural Resources	1 August 2007	Concerned about large number of towers, and the close proximity of a number of those towers to the shoreline and wetland area, in the north west corner of the Island	A discussion of actual setbacks to wetlands has been added to Section 7.8.3 of the Final EA.
5 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott)	Email to: Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada S. Colman, Ministry of Natural Resources	1 August 2007	Requesting the Project be reviewed and considered in light of the following: 1. Is WI an area of significant wildlife habitat as defined by the PPS, and if so, are there areas where development should not occur?	A discussion of significant wildlife habitat, as defined by the MNR's Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide, has been added to Section 7.9.4 of the Final EA.
6 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott)	Email to: Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada S. Colman, Ministry of Natural Resources	1 August 2007	2. following provisions of the PPS Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide should be referred to and commented on – please note on pg 82 of the Reference Maual, it is recognized that WI is a known and mapped significant waterfowl habitat 4.4.6 Shorebird migratory stopover areas 4.4.7 Landbird migratory stopover areas (specifically mentions WI) 4.4.9 raptor winter feeding and nesting areas 4.4.10 turkey vulture summer roosting areas 8.5.7 osprey nesting habitat (current osprey nest in the proposed location for the transformer station) 8.5.8 turtle nesting habitat	A discussion of significant wildlife habitat, as defined by the MNR's Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide, has been added to Section 7.9.4 of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
7 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott)	Email to: Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada S. Colman, Ministry of Natural Resources	1 August 2007	use of ranking: area has been ranked as level 4 or highest significant level by fed ranking system – important to review and rank proposed development area in accordance with the principles set out in the PPS	A discussion of significant wildlife habitat, as defined by the MNR's Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide, has been added to Section 7.9.4 of the Final EA.
8 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott)	Email to: Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada S. Colman, Ministry of Natural Resources	1 August 2007	No discussion in draft ERR or in any other document that we have seen about how much of the significant habitat in the project area to protect, or how best to protect it, by applying the suggested values in table 10-1-1	A discussion of significant wildlife habitat, as defined by the MNR's Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide, has been added to Section 7.9.4 of the Final EA.
9 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott)	Email to: Project webmail cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada S. Colman, Ministry of Natural Resources	1 August 2007	Continue to believe best approach to this project is to identify areas of habitat that should be protected, rather than siting turbines in areas of potential negative impact, and monitoring the effects. Our opinion that this approach is in direct violation of the approach set out in the PPS	A discussion of significant wildlife habitat, as defined by the MNR's Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide, has been added to Section 7.9.4 of the Final EA.
1 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott)	Email to D. Ramsay, Minister of Natural Resources cc. Project webmail	09 August 2007	As per minutes of settlement of recent OMB hearing, Dr. James Day and Sarah McDermott are to be receiving copies of the comments made by Agencies on the DRAFT ERR Please forward me a copy of the comments	No response required

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
1 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and S. McDermott)	Email to: Project webmail cc. Rob Miller, Canadian Hydro Developers	14 August 2007	Writing in regard to OMB settlement, which agreed clients would receive copies of agency comments to the DRAFT ERR Have not yet been forwarded any correspondence Please confirm that minutes of settlement will be complied with.	CREC responded with a PDF of all agency comments received to date on DRAFT EA
Eliot, Smith Barristers & Solicitors (representing J. Day and B. Horne)				
1 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and B. Horne)	Email to: K. Griffiths, Ministry of Natural Resource cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Day Project webmail	16 August 2007	Forwarding note below for your information and review in consideration of the WI wind farm project	No response necessary.
2 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and B. Horne)	Email to: K. Griffiths, Ministry of Natural Resource cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Day Project webmail	16 August 2007	Also had opportunity to review comments made in respect to draft ERR, note that you have not identified towers (35, 36) located at head of Button Bay wetland as sites of concern Towers are on fringe of wetland, also border critical and mature wooded area on south shore	This comment is directed at the MNR. CREC is unable to respond on behalf of the agency.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
3 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and B. Horne)	Email to: K. Griffiths, Ministry of Natural Resource cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Day Project webmail	16 August 2007	Also on edge of properties owned by Bruce Horne and Dr. Day, both of whom have identified their property for conservation purposes, with a view toward enhancing the critical habitat provided by that area	No response necessary.
4 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and B. Horne)	Email to: K. Griffiths, Ministry of Natural Resource cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Day Project webmail	16 August 2007	Note from Dr. Day: Witnessed flock (1500-2000) Purple Martins staging in area beside road just east of Bayfield Bay indicating use made by migrating birds of various species of concern often in large numbers moving across land bridge of WI	Thank you for the information. All comments received on the Draft EA have been considered during the preparation of the Final EA.
5 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and B. Horne)	Email to: K. Griffiths, Ministry of Natural Resource cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Day Project webmail	16 August 2007	Should also report conversation with another resident of WI who has recently witnessed Monarch butterflies in numbers that weighed down tree branches in autumn , in areas where I too have seen such numbers	Thank you for the information. All comments received on the Draft EA have been considered during the preparation of the Final EA.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
6 Eliot, Smith (representing J. Day and B. Horne)	Email to: K. Griffiths, Ministry of Natural Resource cc. S. Allan, Environment Canada J. Day Project webmail	16 August 2007	WI has not been identified as being a major migratory route for monarch and other butterflies which is intuitively wrong based on strategic location of WI and proven to be so	Butterflies were the subject of Technical Appendix C8.
Eliot, Smith Barristers & Solicitors				
1 Eliot, Smith	Email to: R. Helie, Environment Canada cc. J. Gerretsen, M.P.P Kingston and the Islands D. Duncan, Minister of Energy Project webmail	16 April 2007	Writing with respect to an issue that we believe is vital to the ongoing viability and sustainability of developed wetlands and bird migratory corridors in the Great Lakes Region Currently there is a proposal to erect 86 wind turbines on WI. In Dec, 2006, Municipal Council of Township of Frontenac Islands, passed the zoning by-law that set the minimum setbacks for the project, prior to the completion and release of the Environmental Screening Report, (ESR). An appeal has been filed at the OMB, arguing that the environmental features of a potential site for wind development must be identified and recognized before the siting of the towers can be done in a sustainable manner.	No response necessary.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
2 Eliot, Smith	Email to: R. Helie, Environment Canada cc. J. Gerretsen, M.P.P Kingston and the Islands D. Duncan, Minister of Energy Project webmail	16 April 2007	In spring of 2006, the proponent of the wind project started to request that the Township council pass the official plan and zoning by law amendments, assuring them that the environmental screening was 'nearing completion' and would be delivered by the summer. Summer passed without the release of the report, and yet again, the proponent assured the township it was coming 'any time'. The report has yet to be completed or released, and in fact, recently, it was announced that due to a 'number of issues that require more study', the process is being voluntarily elevated to an Environmental Assessment by the proponent	The timeline established for the project was a "best estimate", however delays are common with any complex development such as this. Additional studies were conducted in response to public concerns and as a result delayed the release of the EA.
3 Eliot, Smith	Email to: R. Helie, Environment Canada cc. J. Gerretsen, M.P.P Kingston and the Islands D. Duncan, Minister of Energy Project webmail	16 April 2007	There has been no information released as to the basis of the decision, and it has been announced that the study will not be completed until sometime this summer. However, on March 27, 2007, an open house was held to disclose the siting of the towers, based on the minimum setbacks in the zoning by-law.	No response necessary.

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
4 Eliot, Smith	Email to: R. Helie, Environment Canada cc. J. Gerretsen, M.P.P Kingston and the Islands D. Duncan, Minister of Energy Project webmail	16 April 2007	It is our position in the appeal that sustainable planning, in accordance with the PPS, requires the council to consider the environmental issues and recommendations in the ESR prior to passing the planning amendments for the project.	The details related to the passing of the Zoning By-law amendment are under municipal jurisdiction and this amendment is part of the planning process. Disputes regarding the Zoning By-law have been resolved at the Ontario Municipal Board hearing in July 2007.
5 Eliot, Smith	Email to: R. Helie, Environment Canada cc. J. Gerretsen, M.P.P Kingston and the Islands D. Duncan, Minister of Energy Project webmail	16 April 2007	This position has been generally accepted and supported in the industry, and was the basis for the company's application for Leave to Construct, filed with the OEB. The application set out the following timelines: • Commence environmental screening process: July 2004 • Complete provincial and federal assessment process: July 2006 • Issue statement of completion: August 2006 • Obtain official plan and zoning by law amendments: September 2006	Please refer to Comment # 2
6 Eliot, Smith	Email to: R. Helie, Environment Canada cc. J. Gerretsen, M.P.P Kingston and the Islands D. Duncan, Minister of Energy Project webmail	16 April 2007	It is our opinion that failure of the legislation to identify the need for the completion of the environmental screening prior to passing of planning amendments, gives rise to a serious and fatal impediment to sustainable development We are concerned that the project has become driven by economic consideration, rather than environmental issues, and that the Island's unique and essential environmental importance may be overlooked and buried in the political rhetoric of green power	Please refer to Comment # 4

Name	Method	Date	Comments Received	Response
7 Eliot, Smith	Email to: R. Helie, Environment Canada cc. J. Gerretsen, M.P.P Kingston and the Islands D. Duncan, Minister of Energy Project webmail	16 April 2007	Hoping that you will take some time to consider the project and the issues raised above, and forward these concerns to all necessary parties at EC, to ensure that the issues affecting the international and domestic development and sustainability of Great Lakes wetlands and migratory bird patterns will be reviewed.	No response necessary.
8 Eliot, Smith	Email to: R. Miller, Canadian Hydro Developers Project Webmail	21 Sept 2007	Would we please have the MNR bird comments dated May 23 2007. Also, we understand that the Environment Canada comments will be released any day. Please confirm that a copy will be forwarded to our attention.	CREC has forwarded these comments to the appellants.

Appendix A

Petitions

WIND POWER PROJECT FOR WOLFE ISLAND

In response to the information made available at the Open House, Centre 70, Kingston Ontario on July 21,2004 regarding the transmission of electricity from the wind turbines on Wolfe/Simcoe Islands, we the undersigned state, although in favour of renewable power, have concerns with regard to the routing options.

We believe that:

1. The first and best option is to have the lines come ashore at the Cataraqui Bay, then connect to Alternative Route C and then to Alternative Route B northward to the Gardiner Transformer Station. This route would be over Invista/Federal Properties and would allow now or in the future to connect easily with the proposed Carruther's Point windmill energy source. Secondly the transmission lines would not then infringe on residential and public park and public water access areas.

2. The second option would be to have the lines come ashore on the west shore of Sand Bay (on Invista Property) and then connect to Alternative Route B northward over Invista Property to the Gardner Transformer Station.

Note—Under no circumstances should transmission lines (above or underground be routed through the Wartman/Paterson Park Public Access areas in the vicinity of the Kingston West Water Treatment Plant.

NAME (print)	ADDRESS (print)	SIGNATURE
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]

ECEIVED
MAY 0 1 2007

Wolfe Island wind turbine power plant

REQUEST TO RESCIND REZONING BY-LAW

I believe that the best interests of the community have NOT been served by quickly re-zoning to allow for an 86-turbine complex in the residential community of Wolfe Island.

I believe that proper legal and environmental procedure was NOT adhered to in the approval of the Wolfe Island wind turbine power plant which, at present, includes plans for 86 turbines throughout a residential community.

I believe that the project should NOT proceed according to the plans laid out by Calgary-based Canadian Hydro Development Incorporated.

I am requesting that Council for Frontenac and the Islands immediately rescind the rezoning by-law that has been hurriedly pushed through without adequate consideration INCLUDING AN ENVIRONMENTAL SCREEN REPORT being available for the public to view and raise concerns.

Name / Signature / Date [redacted] / APRIL 26/2007

Name / Signature / Date _____

Address: [redacted]

E-mail/telephone: [redacted]

Other comments: [redacted]

Please return to:

Mail:
WIRE (Wolfe Island Residents for the Environment)
P.O. Box 218
Wolfe Island, ON K0H 2Y0

E-mail (if you wish to scan and send back): info@wolfeislandresidents.ca

For more copies of this petition, please e-mail: info@wolfeislandresidents.ca and we will email you back a PDF to print out as many as you like.

WOLFE ISLAND RESIDENTS
for the Environment

SUPPORT FOR WOLFE ISLAND WIND PROJECT

I support the Township of Frontenac Islands decision to approve a Wind Project on Wolfe Island. I believe the process to approve the zoning by-law was open, transparent and public. I have confidence in the environmental assessment and planning processes being used. The Wolfe Island Wind Project has many environmental and economic benefits.

NAME	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	FULL TIME RESIDENT? (X)	SEASONAL RESIDENT? (X)
[redacted]				X
				X
				X
				X
				X
			X	X
				✓
			X	
			X	
				X

NOTE: I understand that the personal information collected here may be disclosed as part of a public hearing on the Wolfe Island Wind Project.