

Appendix G11

Interest Group Correspondence



**INTEREST GROUP
CORRESPONDENCE**

WOLFE ISLAND WIND PROJECT

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11

File No. 160960180
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 November 6, 2007

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11

INTEREST GROUP CORRESPONDENCE

Table of Contents

1.0 NOTICE OF COMMENCEMENT TO RELEASE OF DRAFT EA.....	1
1.1 GENERAL PROJECT COMMENTS	1
1.1.1 Kingston Field Naturalists	1
1.1.2 Ducks Unlimited Canada	3
1.1.3 Girl Guides of Canada	6
1.1.4 Dupont and Invista	8
1.1.5 Kingston Boardsailing Association	8
1.1.6 Kingston Yacht Club	10
1.1.7 Other Interest Groups	12
2.0 RELEASE OF DRAFT EA TO NOTICE OF COMPLETION	17
2.1 GENERAL PROJECT COMMENTS	17
2.1.1 Ducks Unlimited Canada	17
2.1.2 Kingston Boardsailing Association	17
2.1.3 Other Interest Groups	18
2.2 COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EA.....	21

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11

COMMENTS FROM INTEREST GROUPS

Notice of Commencement to Release of Draft EA

November 2007

This page left blank intentionally.

1.0 Notice of Commencement to Release of Draft EA

1.1 GENERAL PROJECT COMMENTS

1.1.1 Kingston Field Naturalists

	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
From	Sid Andrews, President	Letter	17 Apr 2003	• KFN pleased to note that there will be appropriate lighting on turbines at night to reduce bird and bat mortality – however, KFN has outstanding issues: • Construction Phase, Proximity of Wetlands • Bird and Bat mortality • Protocol for Responding to High Mortality Rates • Clarification of KFN Interests in Research • CREC’s Responsibility to Research • While wind power as a greener form of energy is an attractive alternative to traditional sources of electricity, KFN’s objective with regard to this project is the preservation of natural habitat (wetlands) and the species which depend on it (migrating birds and bats, breeding and overwintering birds)		
To	Sid Andrews, President	Letter	11 May 2004	• Notice of Commencement		
To	Erwin Batalla, President	Letter	06 Jul 2004	• Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	Erwin Batalla, President	Letter	27 Jul 2005	• Notice of Modification sent		
To	Sid Andrews, President	Letter	02 Mar 2006	• Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	Erwin Batalla, President	Letter	02 Mar 2006	• Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	Sid Andrews, President	Letter	08 Mar 2007	• Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
To	Erwin Batalla, President	Letter	08 Mar 2007	• Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
From	Chris Grooms	Email	29 Mar 2007	• Attached: bird inventory report prepared for Acres	3 Apr 2007	• it was good to meet you, Erwin, Elaine, and to get KFN perspective and local knowledge about WI
From	Erwin Batalla President	Letter	10 Apr 2007	• KFN attended the Open House held in March and welcome the opportunity to comment on the environmental aspects of this project. • Enclosed is a letter sent in April 2003 to Acres, in response to the ESR. (At that time, there were only 13 turbines considered). • Concerns about the current proposal of 86 turbines remain the same, namely the impacts on the environment	25 Apr 2007	• Thank you for your letter, we appreciate your involvement. • While we have yet to complete the ESP for the Project, we are aware that Wolfe Island is an Important Bird Area for waterfowl. During the course of the project, we have accumulated both primary and secondary information on

	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
				during the construction operation of the turbines. - Some of the lands optioned for construction are adjacent to significant wetlands and the possibility of sediments from any excavation settling in the wetlands is worrisome. Every effort should be made to site access roads and underground cables as far away from the wetland boundaries as possible. - During operation, our primary concern is bird and bat mortality from collision with the rotating blades. Any lighting system on the turbines' towers will attract insects and birds and bats will follow. The possibility of collision with the turbines' blades exists and a close monitoring of the mortality at these sites is highly desirable. A protocol for shutting down a turbine that experienced a high mortality rate should be developed.		this subject. - Stantec will continue working with DUC and local wildlife groups such as the KFN, government agencies, residents, and other stakeholders to obtain additional information as part of the ESP - The ESP will incorporate all information collected as part of earlier iterations of the Project, including natural heritage studies of waterfowl, raptors, breeding birds, and bats and will also include other biological studies related to herptiles, fisheries, and aquatic and terrestrial vegetation. - The ESP will consider all phases of the project including construction, operation, and repowering / decommissioning. The placement of project components relative to sensitive landscape features will be considered during the ESP. - As you may be aware there are numerous factors that combine to influence the location of turbines, some of which include: regional wind regime, local wind regime, lands under Option to CREC, location of environmental features, municipal setbacks, provincial setbacks, predicted environmental noise levels and non-participating residences, wake effects, among others. - In addition to adherence to the necessary provincial setbacks from wetlands (typically understood to be 120m from a provincially significant wetland to a wind turbine), sediment control measures will be installed in areas where there is the potential for sedimentation of wetland features as a result of excavation activities. - With respect to turbine lighting, the project must comply with the aviation safety lighting and marking standards specified by Transport Canada as set out in the <i>Canadian Aviation Regulations and Standards</i>. Our current understanding of the draft standards is that wind turbines more than 900m from another turbine with an aviation standard light will also require a light. Based on current draft standards, and past experience, it is not expected that all of the 86 turbines will require an aviation safety light on top of the tower. - Environment Canada and Canadian Wildlife Service are currently developing industry-wide protocols for post construction monitoring of wind farms with respect to birds. It is expected that Wolfe Island will be required to adhere to these protocols.
From	Erwin Batalla	Letter	10 Apr 2007	Concerns remain the impact on environmentally sensitive wetlands on WI during the construction and the impact on the fauna (birds and bats) during the operation of wind turbines		Response pending

	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
				- Have noted 3 turbines are less than 400 metres from the wetland at Sand Bay, 5 turbines are less than 400 metres from the Provincially Significant Wetland at Big Sandy Bay and 1 turbine less than 400 meters from the wetland at Bayfield Bay - For these 9, extra care should be taken to prevent the runoff of sediment into the wetlands during the construction of the temporary roads leading to these sites - One turbines is as close as 120 metres from a wetland - This distance is insufficient to insure that no contamination of the wetland will take place - We would request that this turbine be relocated to increase setback distance - The lighting will be limited to turbines on the exterior perimeter, excellent step to reduce bird and bat fatalities - Encourage CREC to make every effort to limit the number of lit towers in accordance with the rules set out by TC - Would appreciate access to the Bird and Bat Mortality surveys conducted at other CREC sites in operation at other locations in Ontario - Would expect similar studies to be conducted at WI in the first year of operation, during spring migration, nesting season, fall migration and during the overwintering of raptors on the Island - Would like the upcoming ERR to clearly indicate quantitative targets for unacceptable mortality at a turbines for each different species groups (bats, songbirds, waterfowl and raptors) – protocol for shutting down a turbines that exceeds any of these targets should be included		

1.1.2 Ducks Unlimited Canada

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
To	Ron Maher	Letter	11 May 2004	Notice of Commencement		
To	Scott Muir, Coastal Wetlands Biologist	Letter	06 Jul 2004	Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	Ron Maher	Letter	27 Jul 2005	Notice of Modification		
To	Ron Maher	Letter	02 Mar 2006	Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	Scott Muir, Coastal Wetlands Biologist	Letter	02 Mar 2006	Notice of Public Open Houses		
From	Owen Steele, Head Conservation Planning	Letter	10 Apr 2006	- There are two areas of concern that should be taken into consideration during the planning of this project. - Firstly, the portion of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River that surrounds Wolfe Island provides continentally important staging habitat for waterfowl during both spring and fall migrations. Long term Canadian Wildlife Service waterfowl survey data for the area indicate approximately 3.5M waterfowl use days annually. This is the third highest use rate for the Ontario side of the lower Great Lakes Coast. Use is a mix of both diving duck and dabbling duck species and as such means that potential impacts of the project on the offshore open water, coastal emergent wetlands, inland wetlands and field feeding habitats needs to be considered.		

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11
COMMENTS FROM INTEREST GROUPS
 Notice of Commencement to Release of Draft EA
 November 2007

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
				- Secondly, the footprint of the project (turbines and transmission corridor lines on both the Island and the mainland) relative to sensitive landscape features such as wetlands, including DUC wetland conservation projects, needs assessment. - DUC is most interested in accepting the invitation that was extended to us by Allan to participate in designing and implementing a future monitoring program that would evaluate the extent of any impacts of this project and recommend appropriate adaptive management activities. This science would also prove beneficial in the evaluation of other similar projects under consideration. - We appreciate Stantec's interest and willingness to consider the potential impacts of this project on waterfowl and their habitat, and for consulting with our organization. We look forward to additional discussions as this project is advanced.		
To	Owen Steele, Head Conservation Planning	Letter	27 Apr 2006	- While we have yet to complete the ESP for the Project, we are aware that Wolfe Island is an Important Bird Area for waterfowl. During the course of the project, we have accumulated both primary and secondary information on this subject. - Stantec will continue working with DUC and local wildlife groups such as the Kingston Field Naturalists, government agencies, residents, and other stakeholders to obtain additional information as part of the ESP. - The ESP will incorporate all information collected as part of earlier iterations of the Project, including natural heritage studies of waterfowl, raptors, breeding birds, and bats and will also include other biological studies related to herptiles, fisheries, and aquatic and terrestrial vegetation. - The placement of project components (e.g., turbines and transmission lines) relative to sensitive landscape features is being considered during the ESP. There are numerous factors that combine to influence the location of 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 (from environmental features), predicted environmental noise levels and non-participating residences, wake effects (i.e., the turbulence one turbine creates on an adjacent turbine), etc. - Thank you for the mapping that you provided to us showing DUC wetland conservation projects located on Wolfe Island and the Kingston mainland. This mapping will be used during the turbine siting process, which is currently ongoing. - CREC has produced a document entitled "Environmental Overview Report, 03 March 2006" that contains additional details regarding construction activities, processes and techniques to minimize environmental effects, including disruptions to nearby landowners and residents. This document is available on the project website, but we can send a CD-ROM if you would like. - We have added your contact information to our database and you will be notified of the date and location of our next Public Open House.		
To	Owen Steele, Head Conservation Planning	Letter	20 Dec 2006	- updated information regarding proposed route and construction methods of mainland transmission line associated with Wolfe island project - background information: CREC is proposing to construct a 197.8MW wind plant on WI - preliminary preferred route for mainland transmission line comes ashore at Point Pleasant, mainland portion proposed to be underground - DUC has been aware for some time that the preliminary preferred route runs along the existing ROW through CSC lands and the DUC wetland restoration project. It has been a recent development that this power line is now underground instead of above - Attached is info on construction methods along with projection and mitigation measures that may be used for	16 Jan 2007	- as a follow up to our telephone conversation regarding the potential effects of a buried transmission line across the CSC lands we have reviewed the proposal and offer the following comments: - the location of the buried transmission line as shown on the CADD#4.3.007 poses minimal impact to our wetland project. Depending upon the time of year the construction is undertaken, disturbances to nesting waterfowl may occur in the surrounding uplands

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11
COMMENTS FROM INTEREST GROUPS
 Notice of Commencement to Release of Draft EA
 November 2007

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
				implementation of transmission line in area of DUC wetlands – ERR will provide additional information - This information has been provided to DUC as means of keeping DUC updated on project progress - Would greatly appreciate comments from DUC - Please feel free to contact Kara if any questions of comments arise - Attached to letter: construction methodology and effects management, Figure 1: preliminary preferred route, Figure 2: Vegetation communities and preliminary preferred route within the DUC wetland, Figure 3: Typical Trench detail for 230kV buried cables		DUC is concerned however that our access to the project for maintenance purposes not be limited by the underground line. We occasionally require a tracked excavator to access the project from the construction access located on the east side of the existing transmission line. Although we don't anticipate an issue with machinery crossing over the buried line we wish to confirm that this will not be a future issue
To	Owen Steele, Head Conservation Planning	Letter	24 Jan 2007	- Wolfe Island Wind project – 230kV transmission line - Thank you for comments dated Jan 16/07 - Attached drawing for OS's files that shows the proposed cross section of the trench and 230kV buried cable - After construction, there should be no limitations or impacts in terms of future site access and maintenance, please consider this as confirmation of this point, based on your request - With the above confirmation on access to the DUC project, and on the understanding that all other concerns related to the power line have been addressed to the satisfaction of DUC, we would greatly appreciate DUC approval and sign off for this section of the transmission line works		
From	Owen Steele	Letter	12 Feb 2007	- letter follows previous correspondence dated Jan 16, 2007 regarding transmission line portion of the WI wind project that crosses the Collin's Bay Correctional Services Canada land - based on design details provided in Figure 1 and Figure 2, and your confirmation that the buried transmission line would not in habit any future machinery access required by the DUC to maintain our wetland restoration project on the Collin's Bay property, we have no concern with this portion of the WI wind project as proposed		
To	Owen Steele	Letter	08 Mar 2007	Notice of commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
To	Scott Muir	Letter	08 Mar 2007	Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
To	Ron Maher	Letter	08 Mar 2007	Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
From	Owen Steele	Letter	Received 09 Mar 2007	Provided brief history and description of the CSC Frontenac Institution Farm property and DUC wetland restoration project		
From	Owen Steele	Letter	19 Apr 2007	- outlines two issues: - potential disturbance issues related to waterfowl in the open water of Lake Ontario, the near shore and inland wetland habitats and on the inland field feeding areas - potential impact of the project footprint relative to sensitive wetland features including DUC project - DUC disagrees with one of the display boards which stated that “most birds will be unaffected by the operation of the wind turbines since they are located on agricultural land” - DUC stated that this project could affect waterfowl by reducing availability of field feeding opportunities – therefore affecting waterfowl density and distribution - Potential for disturbance issues may also result in reduction of breeding waterfowl home ranges, thereby reducing reproductive success and/or breeding pair densities - Suggests that the 120m setback from PSWs be extended to include all wetlands - DUC would be interested in having a map of their DUC project layer that they provided to Stantec overlaid with the current proposed turbines locations - As indicated in their April 10, 2006 comments, DUC would be interest in participating in the design and		Response pending

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11
COMMENTS FROM INTEREST GROUPS
Notice of Commencement to Release of Draft EA
November 2007

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
				implementation of a future monitoring program that would increase their understanding of the potential waterfowl disturbance issues related to wind power projects The “multi year field surveys and extensive literature search” that has been completed on waterfowl as indicated at the POH is a good initial step in this direction		

1.1.3 Girl Guides of Canada

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
From	Peter Ginn	Public Open House comment card	23 Mar 2006	- Two aspects concern us: - Plan shows high transmission lines (aerial) adjacent to Girl Guide Camp – Carruthers Pt. Need to carry lines underground well beyond Guide Camp to maintain atmosphere of site. - Destruction of shore fringe woodlands where underground transmission lines come ashore	Letter 13 Apr 2006	- 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 industrial lands and not on Girl Guide property - all reasonable measures will be used to avoid tree cutting.
To	Peter Ginn	Email	17 April 2006	- Attached: as requested, a preliminary drawing of the transmission towers being considered for the mainland portion of the transmission line. - Several considerations go into determining whether the transmission line is buried or overhead - CREC is proposing that the majority of the transmission line on the mainland be routed overhead	Email from Peter Ginn 7 May 2006	Working on a more formal response to the issues he noted. It may take a few weeks.
From	Bonnie Porteous, Chair – Camp Property Committee	Letter	10 May 2006	- The Kingston Division of Girl Guides has had a camp on the west shore of Carruthers Point for nearly 80 years. The property contains flora and fauna unique to the city and represents an Oasis within the city. It has been used by generations of girls as a campsite. - Evening meetings and day camps are common at this location and both Queen’s and Carleton University use the site for outdoor biology classes. - The above ground transmission line will be very close to the guide property and the transmission towers will be 35 meters tall and certainly crate a visual intrusion on the otherwise rural nature of our property. - We understand the importance of this project, however we feel strongly that any use of overhead transmission lines within 200m of Girl Guide property to convey the power from Wolfe Island adversely affects the aesthetics and thereby the purpose of an outdoor camp for those who use it.		
N/A	Bonnie Porteous, Chair – Camp Property Committee	Site visit	31 May 2006	Attendees: Girl Guides, CREC, Stantec		
To	Bonnie Porteous, Chair – Camp Property Committee	Letter sent by email	03 June 2006	- Thank you for the opportunity to meet with you at the Girl Guide camp on Carruthers Point last Wednesday 31 May as a follow-up to your letter dated 10 May 2006. - We trust that the information we provided was useful and has helped to address the Girl Guides’ comments regarding the project, including the routing and form of the overhead transmission line on Carruthers Point. Considerations that are used to develop the proposed transmission line route include environmental,		

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11
COMMENTS FROM INTEREST GROUPS
Notice of Commencement to Release of Draft EA
November 2007

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
				engineering and economic aspects. - I have attached the preliminary drawing of the proposed pole structures for the overhead line. From a visual perspective, these monopole structures have advantages over steel lattice-type towers because they help minimize the visual effects on the landscape. I have also included recent correspondence with Mr. Peter Ginn of your organization. - Construction activities for the project are scheduled to occur throughout 2007 and 2008. The transmission lines and other associated infrastructure would likely occur in 2007, with the turbines being erected in 2008. - CREC has produced a document entitled “Environmental Overview Report, 03 March 2006” that contains additional details regarding construction activities, processes and techniques to minimize environmental effects, including disruptions to nearby landowners and residents. This document is available on the project website, but we can send a CD- ROM if you would like. - We have added your contact information to our database and you will be notified of the date and location of our next Public Open House.		
From	Bonnie Porteous, Chair – Camp Property Committee	Email	03 Jul 2006	- Hope things are progressing well with the Wolfe Island Wind Project - In regards to the main power line, which will be located in the field and any subsequent poles that will be erected; I understood that there would be 1 large transformer type power line located in the field directly across from the camp. - Then I understood that the power line would follow the current hydro system out to the main road and that new poles would be erected to do this, and that these poles would be relatively the same size as the old poles. However, we have been told that we are incorrect and that the new poles will be considerably larger than the poles that are currently there. - We are concerned about the view we have from the front of our property.	05 July 2006	- Thank you for your email - At presently proposed, and discussed during our site visit on 31 May 2006, the transmission line planned for the Kingston mainland will consist of steel monopole structures similar to the ones illustrated in my email of 03 June 2006 - Although the location and number of the new poles has yet to be finalized, the planned location continues to be similar to that which we described on-site. The transmission line would come ashore at Carruther’s Point at a point east of the pump house south of the Girl Guide property. - The new poles will be approximately 35 m tall, whereas the existing wood poles are shorter. Because of the monopole design, the new poles will not significantly obscure the view in front of the Girl Guides property - Pole spacing for the new poles has yet to be finalized, but it is our estimation that likely only two – five poles will be required south of tennis court and baseball diamond on Carruther’s Point, however, feel free to call or email with any questions you have.
From	Bonnie Porteous, Chair – Camp Property Committee	Letter	20 Jul 2006	- Although your email answered some of our questions there are still some concerns being expressed by committee members in connection with the impact of the power lines coming ashore at Carruthers Point and how the route to the main road might affect life at the Girl Guide Camp. - Following site visit, we were under the assumption that there would be one transformer type power line and the transmission line would be strung to the main road via the existing route the current line takes. - We were also under the assumption that the lines used for the transmission would be of the same height as the ones currently located across the road from the camp. - According to some additional information I have gathered this does not appear to be the case. Your most recent email indicates the poles will be approximately 35 m tall and there could be between two and five poles. You also indicated the exact route has not yet been determined. - On behalf of the girls and guiders who enjoy the camp and who have enjoyed it for almost 80 years, I urge	Letter sent by email 12 Sept 2006	- As indicated in past correspondence and discussions, there will be a new, three-phase 230 KV transmission line constructed on the mainland for the Project. - Comments by the Girl Guides have also been considered in designing a transmission route and layout that minimizes potential environmental effects, while maximizing project benefits. - Attached: preliminary layout diagram for Carruthers Point area illustrating the routing and general configuration of the transmission line. - As shown, the transmission line would remain entirely

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11
COMMENTS FROM INTEREST GROUPS
Notice of Commencement to Release of Draft EA
November 2007

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
				Stantec to reconsider the proposed plan to extend the line above ground and consider the underground route.		underground until it reaches a point west of the existing tennis court, where the cable will transition to an overhead line.
To	Bonnie Porteous, Chair – Camp Property Committee	Letter	08 Mar 2007	Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		

1.1.4 Dupont and Invista

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
To	Peter Chantraine	Letter	06 Jul 2004	Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	Peter Chantraine	Letter	02 Mar 2006	Notice of Public Open Houses		
From	Peter Wagner Invista	Comment Card	23 March 2007	Interested in working on transmission and distribution aspects of project		interest passed onto CREC
To	Craig Audette	e-mail	19 Jan 2007	Invitation to Jan 2007 Sunny Acres community meeting		
To	Michael Bates	e-mail	19 Jan 2007	invitation to Jan 2007 Sunny Acres community meeting		
To	Jodi A Kidd	e-mail	25 Jan 2007	invitation to Jan 2007 Sunny Acres community meeting to be forwarded to Peter Kraus, plant manager, and public affairs manager		
To	Peter Chantraine	Letter	08 Mar 2007	Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
To	Michael Bates Peter Kraus	e-mail	19 Apr 2007	- Discussion of Closed Landfill and Hydro One Cable - Rational for the need for a route change		

1.1.5 Kingston Boardsailing Association

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
From	Phil Harvey	Email	06 June 2006	- Interested in obtaining details about the routing of the underwater cables - Would like to know where and how the power cables come ashore along the Kingston waterfront to assess possible impact on local windsurfing - Concerned about the possibility of underwater structures affecting surf in the vicinity of Paterson Park - Water off this park has two of the best shoals	09 June 2006	- It will be necessary to install only one underwater cable to transmit the power from WI to the Kingston mainland - Ultimate routing of this transmission lines has not yet been finalized, however, it is anticipated that the cable will come ashore at Carruthers Point, 1 km east of Paterson Park - It is expected that the cable in the near shore areas will be

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11
COMMENTS FROM INTEREST GROUPS
Notice of Commencement to Release of Draft EA
November 2007

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
				Included general map of Kingston surf spots		installed slightly below the riverbed bottom to help protect it from hazards such as ice scouring and boat anchors - No long term effects on windsurfing are expected - Potential effects of underwater cable placement on recreational uses of these waters will be further determined as part of the ESP, however they are expected to be restricted to the construction phase of the project and be both spatially limited and of temporary duration
From	Phil Harvey	Email	09 June 2006	- It is very good news that the current plan is to use Carruthers Point for the cable entry - Will have minimal impact on windsurfing - Would like to be added to email mailing list		
From	Jim Foster	Phone Call	26 Feb 2007	- Calling on behalf of KBA - Registering concern about cable landfall location in vicinity of Paterson Park - Primarily seeking information about the cable, location where cable will come ashore, and what facilities on shore will look like in order to gauge potential effect on windsurfing activities in that location - Concern about proposed underwater route of cable – portion of route appears to cross a section of reef where KBA members like to wave sail on - What are construction methods? Trenching? Lay on bottom? Changes to waterline? Etc. - Will also e-mail comments.		
From	Phil Harvey	Phone call	07 Mar 2007 (phone call b/w PH and Rob Miller)	- Phil called b/c he saw the OEB Notice in the paper - RM said CHD/Stantec was still working on getting Phil an official letter - RM conveyed: - do not anticipate the cable in its current location, or other, impacting waves - construction will be such that after we are finished they should not even know the cable was there - we are looking at boring - we may not be in the location shown and may in fact be more up in Sand Bay... - There is a shoal right off where we want to bring in the cable, which creates the wave they love, the cable can be routed around obstacles to a certain extent, CRS is doing a detailed bathymetry and geophysical study in April which will help with design and final location of cable - Phil now understands the design process CHD had to go through and its complexity - Phil is supportive of wind - Phil will wait for CHD's response and will circulate it to club		
To	Jim Foster	Letter	08 Mar 2007	Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
To	Phil Harvey	Email	12 Mar 2007	Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11
COMMENTS FROM INTEREST GROUPS
Notice of Commencement to Release of Draft EA
November 2007

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
To	Evan Walmsley	Email	12 Mar 2007	• Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
To	Phil Harvey	Letter by Email	26 Mar 2007	• provided additional detail on the routing and construction plans for the submarine cable • information illustrates why potentially adverse effects to windsurfing or other recreational activities offshore of Paterson Park are not expected as a result of submarine cables • preferred route of submarine cables is still under review and will be presented in the ERR • once final landfall location is selected, CREC will endeavor not to affect underwater features, such as shoals and wave formations in the nearshore area • do not anticipate long term negative, significant, or deleterious effects to the shoal, wave development, wind surfing, swimming, or other recreational uses at Paterson Park • there may be short-term and localized effects during construction that might last a week or two • Attached: submarine cable routing information, submarine cable installation information, map of submarine cable route, map of submarine cable landing, utilities Kingston west intake and outfall locations, figure of a typical 230 kV submarine cable cross-section		

1.1.6 Kingston Yacht Club

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
To	Ralph Shaw	Email	09 Feb 2007	• would like to alleviate your member's questions that have been raised regarding the potential affect that the Wolfe Island Wind Plant might possibly have on sailing in or around Kingston. We propose to do this based on a review of other areas on the water where there are wind turbines as well as do some modeling of our Wind Plant's layout and its relationship to the water. We hope to show you that the Wind Plant will not have a deleterious affect on sailing, especially competitive regattas that attract people from all over the world. In order to try to help us answer these questions I'd like to meet with you to get an idea as to exactly where the regattas take place and when. Canadian Hydro's modeling can examine things like turbulence and wake effects from the turbines and we can show what the wind will be downwind of the machines, say for example 5 or 10 rotor diameters, or 450 to 900 metres away. At this point in time, we are not aware of any potential affects that turbines have on sailing.		
From	Ralph Shaw	Email	12 Feb 2007	• I wonder if we met at the public meeting at the Ambassador Hotel, about a year and a half ago. I was the one who found himself, at the end of the evening, presenting a 'lecture' about the concerns you have me citing, below, to the assembled representatives of the Wolfe Island Wind Project. I seem to recall speaking with someone who was a sailor (I thought out of the Hamilton area). Perhaps that was you. • At the time, I was promised that the issues I raised would be addressed in the economic and environmental impact study being undertaken by your firm. To date, other than this Email, I have neither heard nor seen any response specifically addressing, let along allaying my concerns. • Would be most pleased to meet with you some evening at KYC • Attached pdf of an article which speaks to my concerns	12 Feb 2007	• Thanks for the study; it looks quite detailed and scientific. We will examine it and try to use it in our analysis, although I noted that it is specifically for off shore wind farms, and Wolfe Island as you know is on shore. • • I will call you to arrange a meeting ASAP. We need to get coordinates, latitudes and longitudes, of the areas that you would use for regattas and racing and then we can run our models based on our proposed turbine layout and perform our turbulence and wake effect study. • We can also try to incorporate our findings into our next

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11
COMMENTS FROM INTEREST GROUPS
Notice of Commencement to Release of Draft EA
November 2007

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
						round of open houses towards the end of March and we will meet with you before then as well to go over the findings
From	Ralph Shaw	Phone call Rob Miller and Ralph Shaw	08 Mar 2007	• KYC concerns re turbulence and wake effect from WI turbines affecting KYC/CORK sailing courses in the Lower Gap • Sent us NAV charts showing courses as well as ‘wake effects of large offshore wind farms identified from satellite SAR’ • Most worried about 180 170-220 south winds, relatively light winds 5-10 knots, lighter winds require a greater distance to reform, compared to heavier faster air • He’d like us to demonstrate/model effects of wind turbines • Sailing is very sensitive to wind patterns 200 metres above the surface		
To	Ralph Shaw	Letter	08 Mar 2007	• Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
To	Ralph Shaw, Tim Irwin	Email	08 Mar 2007	• Would like to propose meeting on Thursday March 15 at KYC • Would like to present proposed turbine layout for the WI wind plant and note any comments and questions you may have • Attached notice for Public Open Houses, hope you can attend • Welcome more comments and feedback from KYC and CORK		
	Attendees: Rob Miller Ralph Shaw – Commodore Tim Irwin – CORK Gunnar Heissler (P.Eng.) Paul Davis Dave Coleman (P.Eng.)		15 Mar 2007	RM met with KYC representatives and provided a Project overview and update Noted / collected KYC issues RE locations of race course areas in proximity to turbines.		
To	Ralph Shaw	Email	25 Mar 2007	• Please find attached the assessment and documentation that has been prepared by Canadian Hydro Developers, Inc. for your review with respect to the KYC’s questions, comments, and concerns pertaining to wake effect and turbulence from the Wolfe Island Wind Plant.	26 Mar 2007	• many thanks, will review these documents

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11
COMMENTS FROM INTEREST GROUPS
Notice of Commencement to Release of Draft EA
November 2007

1.1.7 Other Interest Groups

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
To	Algonquin and Lakeshore Catholic School Board	Letter	24 Aug 2005	• Notice of Modification	20 Sept 2005	• Further to your letter of August 24 2005, this is to advise that our Board has no particular comment to make on the above subject matter
To	Algonquin and Lakeshore Catholic School Board	Letter	02 Mar 2006	• Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	Algonquin and Lakeshore Catholic School Board	Letter	08 Mar 2007	• Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
From	Algonquin and Lakeshore Catholic School Board	Webmail	11 Apr 2007	• Writing on behalf of Algonquin and Lakeshore Catholic District School Board • While board appears to be satisfied that the proposed windmills will not negatively impact our school, I have some follow-up questions for which I have been asked to obtain answers • Will transmission lines be installed overhead or buried? • What are the potential impacts of EMF on any of our students walking to and from school?		
To	Corus Entertainment	Letter	08 Mar 2007	• Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
To	Anne Prichard Frontenac Community Futures Development Corporation	Letter	06 Jul 2006	• Sent notice of Cumulative Effects Assessment • Asked for comments	19 Jul 2006	• not aware of any development within or adjacent to the property
To	Globe Realty	Letter	06 Jul 2004	• Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	Globe Realty	Letter	02 Mar 2006	• Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	Hearthmakers Energy Cooperative	Letter	10 May 2004	• Notice of Commencement		
To	Hearthmakers Energy Cooperative	Letter	06 Jul 2004	• Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	Hearthmakers Energy Cooperative	Letter	02 Mar 2006	• Notice of Public Open Houses		
From	Margaret Row Hearthmakers Energy Cooperative	Comment Card	23 March 2007	• Would like more details about the land transmission route, in particular, using poles for such high volumes. • Good luck!	April 21 2006	• 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

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11
COMMENTS FROM INTEREST GROUPS
Notice of Commencement to Release of Draft EA
November 2007

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
						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 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
To	Hearthmakers Energy Cooperative	Letter	08 Mar 2007	Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
To	Peter Tobias Kingston Economic Development Corporation (KEDCO)	Letter	10 May 2004	Notice of Commencement		
To	Peter Tobias Kingston Economic Development Corporation (KEDCO)	Letter	06 Jul 2006	Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	Peter Tobias Kingston Economic Development Corporation (KEDCO)	Letter	02 Mar 2006	Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	Peter Tobias Kingston Economic Development Corporation (KEDCO)	Letter	06 Jul 2006	- Sent notice of Cumulative Effects Assessment - Asked for comments	16 Aug 2006	- Peter Tobias replaced by Bernie Robertson - Information was passed on to Vivian Lamb and then to Steven Sottile from SWITCH Kingston (supported by KEDCO) - Projects proposed in the area include Amherst Island wind power project, wind power project in Prince Edward County, 4 energy projects in the Taylor Kidd Industrial Complex site, proposed biodigestion facility on Wolfe Island, digester gas project in the Ravenshaw sewage treatment facility expansion, new natural gas cogen plant at waterfront on Queen's University campus.
To	Peter Tobias	Letter	08 Mar	Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11
COMMENTS FROM INTEREST GROUPS
Notice of Commencement to Release of Draft EA
November 2007

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
	Kingston Economic Development Corporation (KEDCO)		2007			
To	Limestone District School Board	Letter	02 Mar 2006	• Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	Limestone District School Board	Letter	08 Mar 2007	• Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
To	Prince Edward County Wind co-op	Letter	08 Mar 2007	• Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
To	Queens University	Letter	10 May 2004	• Notice of Commencement		
To	Queens University	Letter	06 Jul 2004	• Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	Queens University	Letter	02 Mar 2006	• Notice of Public Open Houses		
From	Gary Van Loon Queens University	Comment Card	23 March 2006	• We strongly support this activity	13 April 2006	Standard thank you letter
To	Queens University	Letter	08 Mar 2007	• Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
To	St. Lawrence College	Letter	10 May 2005	• Notice of Commencement		
To	St. Lawrence College	Letter	06 Jul 2004	• Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	St. Lawrence College	Letter	02 Mar 2006	• Notice of Public Open Houses		
From	Gary Johnson St. Lawrence College	Comment Card	23 March 2006	• Impressive project • Possible issue could be the downwind wake effects on the Kingston General Hospital smoke stack • P.S. may be interested in investing/shares	13 April 2006	On Comment Card, says MOE spoke to Mr. Johnson, “it’s all ok” Standard thank you letter
To	St. Lawrence College	Letter	08 Mar 2007	• Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
To	Switch Kingston Alternative Energy Cluster	Letter	08 Mar 2007	• Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
To	Bryan Funk Union Gas Ltd.	Letter	06 Jul 2004	• Notice of Public Open Houses		
To	Bryan Funk	Letter	02 Mar 2006	• Notice of Public Open Houses		

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11
COMMENTS FROM INTEREST GROUPS
Notice of Commencement to Release of Draft EA
November 2007

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
	Union Gas Ltd.					
To	Bryan Funk Union Gas Ltd.	Letter	06 Jul 2006	• Sent notice of Cumulative Effects Assessment • Asked for comments		
To	Bryan Funk Union Gas Ltd.	Letter	08 Mar 2007	• Notice of Commencement of Environmental Review and Public Open Houses		
To	Robert Gibicar Bell Mobility	Email	30 May 2006	• Email to see if Bell Mobility, or its affiliates, might have cellular communications on, over, around Wolfe Island; an island located at the eastern end of Lake Ontario, across from Kingston • If Bell Mobility has any RF pathways in this area we would like to identify them now as a precautionary approach to our planning process	Email 31 May 2006	• Pleased to report that the planned wind farm on Wolfe Island will not interfere with any of our MW systems in the area

This page left blank intentionally.

2.0 Release of Draft EA to Notice of Completion

2.1 GENERAL PROJECT COMMENTS

2.1.1 Ducks Unlimited Canada

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
To	Owen Steele	Letter	18 May 2007	• Draft Environmental Assessment Report, Wolfe Island Wind Project • Request that DUC review the draft EA and provide any comments pertinent to DUC’s interest in the project		
To	Owen Steele	Email	06 June 2007	• please find attached a map of the turbine locations and the DUC project lands • look forward to your comments on the DRAFT EA, in meantime, please let me know if you have any questions		

2.1.2 Kingston Boardsailing Association

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
From	Phil Harvey	Email	23 May 2007	• I was talking to guys from Canadian Seabed Research as they finished up their survey today, they indicated that the cable route should be parallel to and just east of the existing cable, making landfall in Sand Bay. This is good news, but I will wait for the official word.	23 May 2007	• That is exactly where we are trying to go and Hydro One has asked us not to cross their existing 8.3 kV submarine cable, will keep you posted
From	Phil Harvey	Email	04 June 2007	• Wanted to state for record that I am happy about new preferred route, thank you for listening to our concerns about Patterson Park shoal	June 4 2007	• Thank you for your support • We are trying to balance and accommodate everyone's requirements • Please keep in mind it is not 100% because we still need our OEB Leave to Construct Approval, as well as MOE EA, DFO, MNR and other Project approvals

2.1.3 Other Interest Groups

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
From	Algonquin and Lakeshore Catholic School Board	Fax	23 May 2007	• Writing to you with reference to the environment review currently underway for the Wolfe Island Wind Project • Our analysis of the project plans indicates that the nearest proposed siting of a wind turbine will be 650 metres from Sacred Heart Catholic Elementary School • Attaching a copy of correspondence presented to our Board of Trustees by a Wolfe Island resident • Document lists a number of concerns which (resident) and other in the school community have with regard to the proposed development and perceived health risks • Our Board is asking that you review the concerns expressed in the attached correspondence with the scope of the environmental review, and that you provide us with your response.	14 June 2007	• Due to the high level of public interest, CREC has made the EA available for stakeholder review and comment • The following sections of the EA addresses (resident's) comments as attached in your letter • Setbacks, Environmental Noise, Public Health and Safety, Low Frequency Noise, Shadow Flicker • For your continued reference, please find enclose a CD copy of the DRAFT EA • We have provided some general information to address the comments • Setbacks: the current project layout indicated a setback from this school of 750 m from the nearest turbine • Second Phase of the Project: there is no proposed or planned second phase of the Wolfe Island Wind Project • Environmental Noise: the Project will meet the MOE's guidelines for Class 3 Rural Areas, which is the quietest designation and the most stringent guidelines • Low Frequency Noise: there is no evidence that modern, or current turbine technology presents any problems related to the generation of infrared or low frequency sound • Shadow Flicker: at distance greater than approximately 500m between a turbine and a receptor, shadow flicker only occurs at sunrise and sunset
From	Limestone District School Board	Letter	14 June 2007	• Writing on behalf of Limestone District School Board • Received the attached correspondence from concerned residents and are forwarding them to you • Appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback to you through the EA you have undertaken on behalf of CREC • Attached letter from Wolfe Island resident	20 June 2007	• Due to the high level of public interest, CREC has made the EA available for stakeholder review and comment • The following sections of the EA addresses (resident's) comments as attached in your letter • Setbacks, Environmental Noise, Public Health and Safety, Low Frequency Noise, Shadow Flicker • For your continued reference, please find enclose a CD copy of the DRAFT EA • We have provided some general information to address the comments • Setbacks: the current project layout indicated a setback from this school of 1150 m from the nearest turbine • Second Phase of the Project: there is no proposed or planned second phase of the Wolfe Island Wind Project • Environmental Noise: the Project will meet the MOE's guidelines for Class 3 Rural Areas, which is the quietest designation and the most stringent guidelines

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11
COMMENTS FROM INTEREST GROUPS
Release of Draft EA to Notice of Completion
November 2007

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
						• Low Frequency Noise: there is no evidence that modern, or current turbine technology presents any problems related to the generation of infrared or low frequency sound • Shadow Flicker: it is generally considered that 900m is the distance where shadow flicker becomes insignificant or non-existent
To	Peter Warth TVOntario	Letter	11 July 2007	• We welcome any input (on draft EA) from TCO so that we can work to identify and address any potential issues TVO may have prior to release of final EA • Attached: Map of Study Area, CD-ROM of Draft WI EA, Report on Analysis of WI WP potential effects on communication systems		•
From	Mark Mattson Lake Ontario Waterkeeper	Letter to Louise Knox	July 2007	• Writing to express Lake Ontario Waterkeeper's concerns about the proposed Wofe Island Wind Project and to recommend a course of action that will help Ontario increase supply of cleaner energy and protect Lake Ontario's natural and social environment • Lake Ontario Waterkeeper has participated in a number of federal environmental assessment processes in the past, always with commitment to ensuring the meaningful public participation, sustainable development, and precautionary decision-making • Waterkeeper understands WI WP will trigger a federal EA • Is also our understanding from the EA registry that the scope of the project already includes the construction and operation of the wind turbines and associated components, including stream crossings • Waterkeeper agrees that this holistic scope is appropriate for the wind development • Questions: How many Agencies should be involved in the EA? What process will provide the most appropriate level of public participation and informed decision making? • CEEA offers a helpful process for determining when and how the CEA Act (the "Act") applies • Using this guide, Waterkeeper submits that there is a project; the project is not excluded from the Act; there is a Federal Authority; there is a trigger; and significant adverse transboundary environmental effects are likely • Provided an summary of how the Act applies to the Project • Importance of WI environment: sits at end of Lake Ontario and beginning of St. Clair River. WI's unique location makes it an important area for migratory birds. It is also home to some of the last true fish habitat on Lake Ontario. • Recent State of the Great Lakes:2007 report notes that Lake Ontario has the worst coastal wetland health on the Great Lakes. The incredible loss of habitat elsewhere on the lakes makes WI even more important to the future health of these shared waterways. Presence of numerous rare fish and bird species and the proximity to the US border underscores the importance of careful, thorough scrutiny of the wind project • Level of public participation: to date, WI residents, Environment Canada, and the scientific community have raised a number of important issues. These issues include impacts on migratory birds and bird habitat. At every turb, they have been told that the federal environmental assessment process is the appropriate forum to address their concerns. Given the level of public concern and the very real threat to migratory birds and bird habitat, Waterkeeper recommends that this project be referred to a review panel. • The Government of Canada has a duty to protect migratory birds and fish habitat. Lower levels of government have expressed their belief that the Government of Canada will protect migratory birds and fish habitat, and have therefore deferred those matters for review during this EA. • Lake Ontario Waterkeeper will support and assist the Government in this matter in any way we can.		•
To	Autism Canada Foundation	Phone call	02 October 2007	• Left message stating that we are preparing an environmental assessment for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, and we are looking at potential effects the Project may have on the environment and the community • We have received some concerns from members of the community regarding the potential effects the wind turbines may have on people with Autism		•

TECHNICAL APPENDIX G11
COMMENTS FROM INTEREST GROUPS
Release of Draft EA to Notice of Completion
November 2007

To / From	Name, Title	Source of Correspondence	Date	Content	Response Date	Response
				• Calling to find out if there is information available on wind turbines and Autism, or noise and Autism, or shadow flicker and Autism, or if they could point me in the direction to where I may find this information		
To	Autism Ontario	Phone call	02 October 2007	• Left message stating that we are preparing an environmental assessment for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, and we are looking at potential effects the Project may have on the environment and the community • We have received some concerns from members of the community regarding the potential effects the wind turbines may have on people with Autism • Calling to find out if there is information available on wind turbines and Autism, or noise and Autism, or shadow flicker and Autism, or if they could point me in the direction to where I may find this information		•
To	Autism Society of America	Phone call	02 October 2007	• Left message stating that we are preparing an environmental assessment for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, and we are looking at potential effects the Project may have on the environment and the community • We have received some concerns from members of the community regarding the potential effects the wind turbines may have on people with Autism • Calling to find out if there is information available on wind turbines and Autism, or noise and Autism, or shadow flicker and Autism, or if they could point me in the direction to where I may find this information		•
To	Autism Society Canada	Phone call	02 October 2007	• Left message stating that we are preparing an environmental assessment for the Wolfe Island Wind Project, and we are looking at potential effects the Project may have on the environment and the community • We have received some concerns from members of the community regarding the potential effects the wind turbines may have on people with Autism • Calling to find out if there is information available on wind turbines and Autism, or noise and Autism, or shadow flicker and Autism, or if they could point me in the direction to where I may find this information		•
From	Lynn Andrews Autism Society Canada	Email	03 October 2007	• Have attached some files with references you may want to check out: Autism Research Centre, National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders Information Clearinghouse, and National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities • Attached excerpt from Dr. Nina Pierpont's rebuttal to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement prepared by Nobel Environmental, LLC, entitled: Wind Turbine Syndrome: Noise, Shadow Flicker, and Health • If you do find any good Canadian sources during your research, would you mind sending them along		•
To	Matt Kabler Autism Research Institute	Phone call	03 October 2007	• Explained that we're doing an EA for a wind turbine project, looking at potential effects the turbines may have on the environment and the community • Have received some concerns from members of the community surrounding wind turbines and their effects on people with Autism • Asked if he has any information on the effects of turbines on people with Autism • MK said he has never heard of turbines affecting people with Autism, has never even heard anecdotal reports • Knows people with Autism can be sensitive to electrical fields • Suggested doing an internet search – has no published information for me		•

2.2 COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EA

#	Page/Section	Issue	Project Response
Ducks Unlimited Canada			
1 Owen Steele 22 June	157 Table 5.2	DUC disagrees with the statement that by siting wind turbines on agricultural lands they will have minimal impact due to the limited amount of natural vegetation removed. Waterfowl utilize agricultural lands for foraging and in the case of haylands and pasture, for nesting. Disturbance has the potential to limit the availability of foraging and nesting habitat and thus affect waterfowl density.	This potential effect was noted in Technical Appendix C5. Text has been added to better reflect the potential effect in other sections of Technical Appendix C5 and in Section 7.9.
2 Owen Steele 22 June	158 Table 5.2	The setback indicated in the table is inconsistent with other sections of the report	Typographic error – correct setback is 100 m. Final report reflects the correct setback in all sections.
3 Owen Steele 22 June	158 Table 5.2	The setback is measured from the tower pedestal and not from the outer edge of the 45 m blades – this effectively reduces the setback of the wind turbines for PSW, non-evaluated, and DUC wetlands by 45 m. The EA document acknowledges this in only one reference.	EA amended to clarify and acknowledge that setbacks are from the turbine centre throughout the document. A list of turbines and distances to PSWs and woodlots greater than 10 ha has been prepared. Turbines with blade sweep areas that are closer than 120 m to a PSW or 50 m to a woodlot over 10 ha are listed in Table 7.3, Section 7.8.3.1.1.
4 Owen Steele 22 June	228 Section 7.8.1.2.2	The DUC wetland restoration overview needs to be modified for this document. The historic landuse mentioned for example is outdated and doesn't reflect current conditions. DUC would be willing to assist with this.	The updated overview of the wetland has been received from DUC and has replaced relevant sections in the Main Body (Section 7.8.1.2.2) and Technical Appendix C7. We thank you for your contribution.
5 Owen Steele 22 June	234 Section 7.8.3.1	DUC agrees with the need for pre-construction communication between DUC and Stantec regarding the work through the wetland restoration area. Our engineering staff should be contacted in order to arrange a site visit in advance of the initiation of this component of the project.	Engineering staff will be contacted post-ESP to arrange for a site visit during the detailed design phase.
6 Owen Steele 22 June	236 Section 7.8.3.2 and 7.8.4.2	The science concerning potential disturbance impacts of wind projects once made operational is weak. This lack of research and understanding should caution against concluding that the project siting of the Wolfe Island project will preclude any disturbance impacts. Human activity associated with the construction of the individual turbines is not the issue.	Both construction and operational impacts were assessed in Section 7. Sections 7.8.3.2, 7.8.4.2, 7.9.3.2 and 7.9.4.2 have been updated with references to additional research, where available, and revised text reflects lack of information where applicable.
7 Owen Steele 22 June	239 Section 7.9.1.1.1	EC 1999 is missing from the appended reference list.	EA amended – EC 1999 added to the reference list.
8 Owen Steele 22 June	239 Section 7.9.1.1.1	The EC 1999 study, as outlined in Technical Appendix C5, was a one year spring waterfowl survey only, and as such represents a limited perspective. Utilizing the CWS "migrant waterfowl survey of major shorelines in Ontario" data set would be more appropriate.	CWS provided this information after the draft EA was circulated. An analysis of this data set has been included in Technical Appendix C5. Thank you for the reference.

#	Page/Section	Issue	Project Response
9 Owen Steele 22 June	245 Section 7.9.2.2.1	Waterfowl disturbance was not identified in the cases of either staging waterfowl along the shoreline or for the birds foraging inland on the agricultural lands. Disturbance to breeding waterfowl and other species of wetland dependent species utilizing wetland habitat that is in close proximity of a wind turbine may also be affected. Monitoring to determine any impact on the density or distribution of these wetland species would be straightforward to determine.	This potential effect was noted in Technical Appendix C5. Text has been added to better reflect the potential effect in other sections of Technical Appendix C5 and in Section 7.9.
10 Owen Steele 22 June	249 Section 7.9.5	Due to the weak science associated with understanding the potential disturbance impacts of wind projects on waterfowl, paired with the continental significance of Wolfe Island for staging waterfowl, it is difficult to understand how the significance rating of “low” could be concluded. A certain degree of uncertainty exists around this issue and post construction monitoring will be required to understand the impact. Some caveat could be attached to the significance rating to reflect this uncertainty.	Text has been added to better reflect the potential effect in other sections of Technical Appendix C5 and in Section 7.9. The rating of “low” indicates that “Potential effect may result in a slight decline in resource in study area during the life of the project. Research, monitoring, and/or recovery initiatives may be required” (Table 7.1) and reflects both the uncertainty and the need for follow-up monitoring.
11 Owen Steele 22 June	385 Section 8.3.2	In the cumulative impacts section, the issue of disturbance (“avoidance behaviour”) is mentioned with respect to waterfowl and the potential of this impact needs to be likewise acknowledged throughout the EA document.	Text has been added to better reflect the potential effect in other sections of Technical Appendix C5 and in Section 7.9.
12 Owen Steele 22 June	390 Section 8.3.3.5 and Table 8.3	Section 8.3 does a better job than the rest of the document in addressing both disturbance and in the case of the 2 nd paragraph, the need for improved science. This need should be reflected in the monitoring section of this EA in order to justify appropriate post construction monitoring programs.	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.
13 Owen Steele 22 June	397 Section 8.6	Uncertain what “RA” stands for.	RA stands for Responsible Authority, which is defined previously in the EA. EA has been amended to define RA in Section 8.1.1 (the first reference in Section 8.0) to clarify for readers.
14 Owen Steele 22 June	407 Section 9.4.1.2	The evaluation of the DUC wetland restoration projects impacted by the wind project construction on the mainland should be conducted in the first full field season following the completion of the construction work.	EA amended to state monitoring will occur in the first full growing season.
15 Owen Steele 22 June	411 Section 9.4.1.2	Nelson & Curry (1995) strongly recommended at least 3 years of post construction monitoring. A longer term monitoring program would strengthen conclusions and provide more meaningful science.	Technical Appendix C5 has been revised and recommends a three-year post-construction monitoring program. The monitoring program should be reassessed at the end of each monitoring year. Pending the reassessment results, the program methodologies, frequencies, and durations may be reasonably modified by the parties to better reflect the findings.
16 Owen Steele 22 June	411 Section 9.4.1.2	Monitoring should include components evaluating potential disturbance impacts on staging and foraging waterfowl.	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.
17 Owen Steele 22 June	411 Section 9.4.1.2	Consideration to assessing the impact on breeding wetland dependent avian species in terms of density and distribution should be considered.	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.

#	Page/Section	Issue	Project Response
18 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 E2	Given the lack of existing science on the potential disturbance impacts of wind turbines on waterfowl, the “small footprint and 120 m setback” provides insufficient justification for reaching this conclusion. Likewise, the statement that “scattered distribution of turbines within 2 km of the shoreline will not create a barrier to waterfowl movement” is also difficult to support with existing science. Both statements should be worded in a less definitive manner to reflect the realities of the existing uncertainty. Potential impacts on field feeding waterfowl that forage in agricultural lands needs to be included in the summary.	Text has been added to better reflect the potential effect in other sections of Technical Appendix C5 and in Section 7.9.
19 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 E3	The statement that “it will be possible to mitigate many of the indirect and direct effects” could be challenging when not all the impacts have been identified or are fully appreciated.	Unanticipated effects will be dealt with through the “adaptive management” portion of the post-construction monitoring agreement. 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.
20 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 E3	“turbines located well outside of wetlands” is inaccurate where turbines are located at the 80 m setback – this represents only a 45 m setback from the edge of the blade – this point was made previously in the main body of the EA	See project response to DUC comment #3
21 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 1.3 Section 1.2.2	The CWS “migrant waterfowl survey of the major shorelines in Ontario” data set should be utilized in this analysis.	See project response to DUC Comment #8
22 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 1.3 Section 1.2.2	The Eastern Habitat Joint Venture, rather than PIF should be referenced in this waterfowl section.	EHJV does not list Wolfe Island as an Area of Concern, or other designation of which we are aware. Further detail would be appreciated.
23 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 2.3 Section 2.3	Staging waterfowl in the nearshore areas are captured in the above referenced CWS survey. These nearshore areas are continentally significant and need to be adequately surveyed both spring and fall.	A multi-year bird monitoring program was developed and implemented using guidance from EC/CWS and MNR.
24 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 3.2 Section 3.1.2	The second paragraph includes the statement “the creation of ponds and canals” which is inaccurate. The correct wording should be “the restoration of wetland habitat”	Text revised accordingly.
25 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 3.8 Section 3.3.1 and Table 3.4	The EC 1999 survey is a spring survey only and thus only represents a portion of the waterfowl value of the Wolfe Island staging areas. The CWS survey data should be utilized.	See project response to DUC Comment #8
26 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 4.8 Section 4.4.2	“Installation of wind turbines in existing agricultural fields will have a limited effect on habitat...”. DUC has expressed concern previously about this statement – it fails to consider the value of residual grain and other feed sources for foraging waterfowl. The reduction in the availability of these food resources could result from disturbance associated with turbines. The staging value of the Island could be impacted as a result.	See project response to DUC Comment #1

#	Page/Section	Issue	Project Response
27 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 Section 4.10	This same issue (as DUC Comment #26) is not mentioned in section 4.10.	See project response to DUC Comment #1
28 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 4.10 Section 4.4.2	Bird strikes and not disturbance is covered in the “marsh” section. Placement of the turbines within 80 m or 120 m may be insufficient to mitigate impact on breeding wetland species such as waterfowl.	Text has been added to better reflect the potential effect in Technical Appendix C5 and in Section 7.9.
29 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 4.10 Section 4.4.2	Monitoring will be required to determine if density and/or distribution of birds is impacted.	See project response to DUC Comment #17
30 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 4.13 Section 4.4.4	The summary section doesn’t mention the potential for waterfowl disturbance as mentioned above with respect to staging, foraging, and possibly breeding birds.	Text has been added to better reflect the potential effect in Technical Appendix C5 and in Section 7.9.
31 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 4.1.3 Section 4.4.5	DUC is not identified, as they were in other portions of the document, as a partner in the development of the waterfowl monitoring.	App C5 amended to include DUC in the list.
32 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 5.1 Section 5	The conclusion section is weak and appears to attempt to over simplify the results. Potential impacts to waterfowl need to be included in the summary in order to be consistent with the remainder of the appendix and the document.	Text revised accordingly.
33 Owen Steele 22 June	App C5 5.2 Section 5	DUC appreciates being identified as a monitoring partner in this section.	No response necessary.
Lake Ontario Waterkeeper			
1 Mark Mattson 25 June	No section specified	The idea that you can complete a federal EA screening report without offering public right to comment and request denial of the project or panel review is just wrong.	Please note that the email you responded to (dated June 6, 2007 from Stantec) was an email notification that the Draft EA had been released for public review and comment.
2 Mark Mattson 25 June	No section specified	Writing to get clarification of the public’s right comment and correct the inaccuracies in the Stantec report before the project is finalized	Please note that the email you responded to (dated June 6, 2007 from Stantec) mentions that stakeholder comments on the Draft EA were being received by Stantec.

#	Page/Section	Issue	Project Response
3 Mark Mattson 25 June	No section specified	The workforce will increase by hundreds on an Island with no industrial base, no sewage treatment and no industrial landfill.	Section 7.19.2.1 of the Draft EA states that sanitary waste generated by the construction crew will be collected via portable toilets and wash stations supplied by a licensed third party. Disposal of this waste will be the responsibility of the contracted third party and they will ensure disposal in accordance with municipal and/or provincial standards. 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.
4 Mark Mattson 25 June	No section specified	Most disturbing, the project hopes to displace current public service ferry users with the private project employees, trucks, subcontractors	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.
5 Mark Mattson 25 June	No section specified	The windmill project as planned is completely disproportionate to the Island's cultural, social and environmental sensitivities and will necessarily have a huge impact.	The Draft EA assessed the potential net effects to the Island's social and environmental features. Please refer to Section 7.0 of the Final EA.
6 Mark Mattson 25 June	No section specified	The project requires the scrutiny of Canada's environmental law processes.	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).
7 Mark Mattson 25 June	No section specified	Federal jurisdiction includes the money being spent on the project by the federal government as well as the 61 water crossings and loss of fish and bird habitat. These activities will require federal oversight in an area on a Great Lake that has been recently ranked poor and deteriorating for wetlands, aquatic habitat and bird and fish breeding.	The federal environmental assessment process has been triggered, and as such, the Project is subject to the <i>Canadian Environmental Assessment Act</i> . Various federal authorities will determine Project requirements based on their jurisdiction and interests. As you mention, some of these federal interests relate to funding and potential effects on wildlife and their habitat.
8 Mark Mattson 25 June	No section specified	Bird and fish study conducted by Doug Howell in 2006 was not mentioned, I personally sent this study to your company but it was ignored.	We have received the study, and it was considered during preparation of the Final EA. Although restoration 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. We hope you proceed with restoration of the old canal and wish you the best of luck.
9 Mark Mattson 25 June	No section specified	The project has too many windmills for such a small community and too many services are required for a community without even proper water treatment infrastructure.	Project construction and operation will require minimal use of municipal services.
10 Mark Mattson 25 June	No section specified	Please let me know if my organization and other community members will be given the opportunity to comment on the EA as part of the federal 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.

#	Page/Section	Issue	Project Response
Algonquin and Lakeshore Catholic District School Board			
1 Doug Campbell 14 August	App C13 P 18	Noted some misinformation in this section of the Draft ERR. The statement, “Finally, the Project will pay an estimated \$390,000 to the local area school boards, directly benefiting the majority of school-aged children in the Study Area.”, is inaccurate and misleading. Since 1997, the education portion of property taxes collected by the municipality has been remitted to the province that funds School Boards on the basis of enrolment. There is no correlation between the amount of education taxes levied locally and the wealth of any particular school board. There is no direct benefit to school children in the study area from the estimated \$390,000 education taxes to be paid by your project. We ask hat this issue be clarified in the final ERR.	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.
2 Doug Campbell 14 August	App C12	Recently reviewed the <u>Assessment of Potential Effects of a Wind Plat on Tourism on Wolfe Island, ON</u> dated February 2007. This document is also attached as an appendix to the Draft ERR. The Algonquin and Lakeshore Catholic District School Board operates the Ryan Centre program at Sacred Heart Catholic School on Wolfe island. We were indeed surprised to learn from your report that our program located that is expanding. It is not.	This statement was made in error, and has been corrected. Appropriate changes have been made to Appendix C12.
3 Doug Campbell 14 August	App C12	We were equally surprised to learn that there are plans for our facility to become an “interpretive centre” for Wolfe Island wind energy for the “traveling public”. There are not.	This statement was made in error, and has been corrected. Appropriate changes have been made to Appendix C12.
4 Doug Campbell 14 August	App C12	We were previously unaware that CREC had donated funds for the purchase of a demonstration wind turbine. While we are appreciative of your support, in this instance, it is understandable that the public may perceive that our program is a paid endorsement for your project. This is unacceptable to us. Attached, please find a cheque in the amount of \$2,200.00 reimbursing your donation.	No response necessary.