

ERNESTOWN WIND PARK CONSULTATION REPORT

Prepared by:

Ernestown Windpark Inc.

as General Partner of Ernestown Windpark LP

2300 Yonge Street, Suite 801

Toronto, Ontario, M4P 1E4



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Introduction	1
Table 1: Regulatory Requirements (See Table 1 in O.REG 359/09)	1
1.1 Project Description.....	2
1.2 Project Contacts.....	2
1.3 Objective	2
Table 2: Summary of Consultations	3
1.4 Communication Tools	3
2.0 Consultation Process.....	4
2.1 Purpose	4
2.2 Methodology.....	4
3.0 Public Consultation	6
Table 3: Public Consultation Overview	6
Table 4: Public Consultation Timeline.....	6
3.1 Public Emails and Letters	7
3.2 Meetings with Landowners and Interest Groups	7
3.3 Community Events and Residential Information Campaigns	8
Table 5: Summary of Outreach Efforts	8
3.4 Public Meetings.....	10
Table 6: Public Meeting Summary	10
Table 7: Public Meeting Notice Publication	10
Table 8: Public Meeting Survey Results	13
Table 9: Summary of Concerns	15
Table 10: Consideration of Public Comments.....	16
4.0 Aboriginal Consultation	23
4.1 Distribution of Notices and Project Reports	23
4.1.1 Distribution of Draft Project Description Report	23
Table 11: Dates and addressee of Project Description and written requests for information.....	24
4.1.2 Distribution of Summaries to Aboriginal Communities and Request for Comments.....	25

Table 12: Dates and addressee of REA report summaries and written requests for information	25
4.1.3 Distribution of Draft REA Documents to Aboriginal Communities	26
Table 13: Dates and addressee of REA report summaries and written requests for information	26
4.2 Alderville First Nation.....	28
Table 14: Summary of Communications with Alderville First Nation	28
4.3 Curve Lake First Nation	29
Table 15: Summary of Communications with Curve Lake First Nation	29
4.4 Hiawatha First Nation	31
Table 16: Summary of Communications with Hiawatha First Nation.....	31
4.5 Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation	33
Table 17: Summary of communications with Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation	33
4.6 Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation.....	34
Table 18: Summary of Communications with the Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation.....	34
4.7 Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte	35
Table 19: Summary of Communications with the Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte	35
4.8 Métis Nation of Ontario	38
Table 20: Summary of Communications with the Métis Nation of Ontario	38
4.9 Northumberland Métis Council	39
Table 21: Summary of Communications Northumberland Métis Council.....	39
4.10 Seven Rivers Métis Council	41
Table 22: Summary of Communications with Seven Rivers Métis Council.....	41
4.11 Summary of Measures for Mitigating Any Adverse Impacts	42
5.0 Municipal & Agency Consultation.....	44
5.1 Loyalist Township and the County of Lennox & Addington.....	44
Table 20: Timeline of Municipal Consultation	44
Table 21: Municipal Consultation Form Contents	46
5.2 Agency Consultation	50
Table 22: Agency Consultation Timeline.....	50
6.0 Changes Made Based on Consultations.....	54
Table 23: Summary REA Report Amendments	54
7.0 Outstanding Items.....	56

Appendix A: Public Consultation Materials.....	I
Appendix B: Aboriginal Consultation Materials	II
Appendix C: Municipal Consultation Materials	III
Appendix D: Consultation with Agencies	IV

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report outlines the process and outcomes of the public, municipal, agency and Aboriginals consultation carried out for the proposed Ernestown Wind Park. This Consultation Report has been prepared according to the specifications in *Ontario Regulation 359/09* made under the *Environmental Protection Act, Renewable Energy Approvals* under part V.0.1 of the Act.

TABLE 1: REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS (SEE TABLE 1 IN O.REG 359/09)

Item	Presented in Report	Section
1. A summary of communication with any members of the public, Aboriginal communities, municipalities, local roads boards and Local Services Boards regarding the project.	Yes	1.3 and 3.0, and Appendices A-C
2. Evidence that the information required to be distributed to Aboriginal communities under subsection 17 (1) was distributed.	Yes	4.0 and Appendix B
3. Any information provided by an Aboriginal community in response to a request made under paragraph 4 of subsection 17 (1).	Yes	Appendix B
4. Evidence that a consultation form was distributed in accordance with subsection 18 (1).	Yes	5.0 and Appendix C
5. The consultation form distributed under subsection 18 (1), if any part of it has been completed by a municipality, local roads board or Local Services Board.	Yes	Appendix C
6. A description of whether and how,		
i. comments from members of the public, Aboriginal communities, municipalities, local roads boards and Local Services Boards were considered by the person who is engaging in the project,	Yes	Appendix A
ii. the documents that were made available under subsection 16 (5) were amended after the final public meeting was held, and	Yes	7.0 and Appendix A
iii. the proposal to engage in the project was altered in response to comments mentioned in subparagraph i.	Yes	N/A
7. A description of the manner in which the location of the wind turbines was made available to the public, if a person proposing to engage in a project in respect of a class 4 or 5 wind facility relied on paragraph 4 of subsection 54 (1.2) or paragraph 4 of subsection 55 (2.2).	Yes	3.5
8. If paragraph 7 applies, proof of the date on which the location of the wind turbines referred to in that paragraph was made available to the public.	Yes	Appendix A

1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Ernestown Windpark Inc. (Ernestown), as general partner of Ernestown Windpark LP, is proposing to develop a wind energy generation facility named Ernestown Wind Park (the Project), located in the Loyalist Township, Ontario, to generate clean renewable energy for connection to the public grid. This project will promote a long-term, low-impact energy that will complement Ontario's goals of clean and sustainable electricity generation, while impacting economic growth in the rural community.

On July 1st 2012 amendments to O.Reg 359/09 came into force. Transition provisions allowed for projects such as this one to opt into following the new regulations or to remain under the previous process. Ernestown Wind Park opted to follow the July 1, 2012 amended regulations.

The project is located on privately owned land, municipally zoned as agricultural and industrial and involves construction, operation and decommissioning of five Enercon E92 2.3 MW wind turbines modified to operate at 2.0 MW for a total nameplate capacity of 10MW. The Project requires construction of new access roads to the turbine sites and a new 44 kV overhead electrical connection line, which will connect with an existing distribution line located along Taylor Kidd Boulevard by way of a new switching station.

1.2 PROJECT CONTACTS

Proponent:

Ernestown Windpark Inc.,
as General Partner of Ernestown Windpark LP
Nhung Nguyen
Vice President of Development
2300 Yonge Street
Suite 801, PO Box 2300
Toronto, ON
M4P 1E4

Toll Free: 1-877-389-4099
Local: 613-770-6116
Main Office: 1-416-864-9977
Fax: 1-416-864-9568
Email: info@ernestownwind.com
Website: <http://www.ernestownwind.com>

1.3 OBJECTIVE

A stakeholder consultation process, involving area landowners and residents, local interest groups, and various interested government and non-government agencies, is mandated by the Renewable Energy Approval (REA) process under *Ontario Regulation 359/09*. The objective of this report is to provide a summary of consultations to date with members of the public, Aboriginal communities, and municipalities, regarding the Ernestown Wind Park project. No local service boards exist for the project area.

A description of each stakeholder group is found in the sections noted in Table 2, below. Individual concerns raised were logged and a number of changes, additions and clarifications to the project or project information have been made as a result. These changes are summarized in Section 6.

TABLE 2: SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS

Consultation Group	Presented in Report	Section
Public	Yes	3.0
Aboriginal Communities	Yes	4.0
Municipalities	Yes	5.0
Agencies	Yes	5.0

1.4 COMMUNICATION TOOLS

The proponent provided a variety of ways for all interested stakeholders to learn about the proposed Ernestown Wind Park and provide their input to the development team. The methods used and specific activities completed for the Project, under O.Reg 359/09 included:

- Newspaper Notices of Commencement and Modification;
- Agency meetings and mailings;
- Public meetings;
- Individual meetings with the adjacent and local landowners to discuss the project and answer site-specific questions about impact on specific properties
- Meetings with local community interest groups
- Aboriginals engagement and community consultation
- Toll-free telephone line (1-844-389-4099)
- Project-specific email addresses (ex: info@ernestownwind.com)
- Mailing addresses for Ernestown Windpark Inc.
- Newsletters providing project updates, upcoming events and community involvement
- Project website (www.ernestownwind.com) which hosts draft REA reports, information about the project, event photos, contact information and public notices

All names, phone numbers, addresses, and comments received by Ernestown Windpark Inc. through the communication tools mentioned above were entered into a communication log and Project database for tracking, responding to questions, and future mailings.

2.0 CONSULTATION PROCESS

2.1 PURPOSE

The stakeholder consultation process seeks to inform interested parties about the proposed project, including its scope, location, purpose, possible environmental effects and proposed mitigation measures. Aboriginal communities, municipalities and interested members of the public are encouraged to respond with their ideas, comments and suggestions, as well as to request any further information they may be interested in.

The objectives of the Ernestown Windpark Inc. consultation process for Ernestown Wind Park, as adapted from the International Association for Impact Assessments (IAIA) Best Practice Principles for Public Participation, are as follows:

1. Undertake consultation early in the planning process and continue throughout the design, development, construction, operation and decommissioning of the Project;
2. Ensure that relevant, accurate, and consistent information about the Project is provided to Project stakeholders, and ensure effective, proactive and responsive communications occur to incorporate feedback into the planning process to the greatest extent possible;
3. Provide opportunities to obtain/identify relevant information and local knowledge in possession of the local communities, municipalities, and Aboriginal communities;
4. Ensure that consultation and communication is context-appropriate, credible, open and transparent, with an attempt to build community support and demonstrate a commitment to the well-being of the community; and
5. Track and document all communications between the Project team and interested parties and to ensure the information is incorporated into the planning of the Project, to the greatest extent possible.

2.2 METHODOLOGY

Consultations were held with Municipalities, Aboriginal communities and members of the public. Consultations included telephone and email exchanges, kitchen table meetings, door-to-door information visits, meet-and-greet events, and public meetings as appropriate. Key concerns were noted, tabulated, and addressed on a case-by-case basis.

Public Consultation for Ernestown Wind Park included four Public Meetings and direct communications via email, mail or telephone to enquiries from public stakeholders. Meetings were held with individual

members of the public as well as interested groups during project development. Concerns raised by members of the public were tabulated and changes to the project or project information were made as appropriate. A summary of discussions with members of the Public is included in Section 3.

Nine Aboriginal Communities were contacted during project development and initial discussions began in 2010. Questions and concerns raised by Aboriginals communities were noted and addressed directly. Section 4 outlines the discussions and concerns raised by these communities.

The County of Lennox and Addington and Loyalist Township were consulted throughout the project development. Both the upper- and lower-tier municipalities were provided with project updates, technical documentation, and studies for review and discussion. Section 5 outlines the key communications and discussions held with each municipality. A record of key documentation submitted to municipalities is included in Appendix C.

The Draft REA Reports were made available for public comment on June 18th, 2012, with the final Public Meeting held on September 18th, 2012. These reports were made available on the project website www.ernestownwind.com and hard copies of the draft reports were made available at the five locations listed below:

1. Lennox and Addington Public Library, Amherstview Branch
2. Lennox and Addington Public Library, Bath Branch
3. Lennox and Addington Public Library, Odessa Branch
4. Lennox and Addington Municipal Office
5. Loyalist Township Municipal Office

3.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Members of the public were provided with several avenues to provide input to the Project. These included input during discussions at each of the three Public Meetings, individual meetings, door-to-door information campaigns, as well as phone, mail and email exchanges throughout the development of the Ernestown Wind Park. Each of these consultations is described in the following subsections as per Table 3, below. Additionally, a timeline of key events occurring during the public consultation process is outlined in Table 4.

TABLE 3: PUBLIC CONSULTATION OVERVIEW

Consultation Method	Section
Public Emails and Letters	3.1
Meetings with Landowners and Interest Groups	3.2
Community Events and Residential Information Campaigns	3.3
Public Meetings	3.4

TABLE 4: PUBLIC CONSULTATION TIMELINE

Date	Event
2010-05-29 and 2010-05-31	Notice of a Proposal and Public Meeting was posted in the Kingston Whig Standard
2010-06-03 and 2010-06-10	Notice of a Proposal and Public Meeting was posted in the Kingston EMC
2010-06-14	Notice of a Proposal and Public Meeting were delivered to land owners living at least 120 from the project location
2010-06-29	Public Meeting held at the Amherstview Community Hall
2010-06-30	Public Meeting held at the Invista Centre
2012-07-17	Notice of a Proposal and Public Meeting and Notice of Public Meeting registered mailed to all registered landowners (56 in total) within 550m of the project location
2012-07-18	Notice of a Proposal and Public Meeting and Notice of Public Meeting was mailed by a mass mailing to 689 residences within approximately 3000m of the project location
2012-07-18	Notice of a Proposal and Public Meeting and Notice of Public Meeting published in Kingston Whig-Standard and project website www.ernestownwind.com
2012-07-19	Notice of a Proposal and Public Meeting and Notice of Public Meeting published in Kingston Whig-Standard, Napanee Beaver, Kingston This Week and Kingston EMC
2012-09-11	Additional Public Meeting held at the Amherstview Community Hall
2012-09-18	Final Public Meeting held at the Odessa Fairgrounds Palace Building

3.1 PUBLIC EMAILS AND LETTERS

Communications between the project proponents and members of the public were focused on information exchange and relationship building. Emails were received requesting more information or clarification of information contained in draft reports. Concerns raised by the public were addressed individually where communications contained questions directed to the project proponent. Appendix A contains a detailed tabulation of the communications received by the public.

- Total number of emails and letters received from the public: 11
- Number of these emails and letters directed towards other entities (MOE, Loyalist Township, Conservation Authority, etc.): 0
- Number of emails and letters submitted which did not request a response: 0
- Total number of responses from Ernestown Windpark Inc.: 11

In addition to the answers provided to those who wrote to the proponent, a Frequently Asked Questions document was prepared and posted on the project website. The counts of commonly encountered inquiries are posted in Appendix A which indicates the counts for email and letters along with other methods of communication.

3.2 MEETINGS WITH LANDOWNERS AND INTEREST GROUPS

Meetings were held with local landowners and interested community groups during project development. These provided opportunities for landowners to ask site-specific questions about the impacts on their property and for groups in the community to collectively discuss concerns with representatives from Ernestown Windpark Inc. Questions were answered directly by the proponent's representatives or in writing when the inquiries needed to be deferred to the development team. A summary of the questions and responses can be found in Appendix A which indicates the question asked, the type of stakeholder they are and the response given. The proponent met with the following groups:

1. Odessa & District Lions Club
2. Helen Henderson Care Centre Residents
3. Kingston Chamber of Commerce
4. SWITCH
5. Odessa Fair Committee
6. Lennox & Addington Snowmobile Association

3.3 COMMUNITY EVENTS AND RESIDENTIAL INFORMATION CAMPAIGNS

Public information displays were set up during community events such as group meetings, networking events and community activities throughout the project development. The displays consisted of information handouts, a project location map, general information about wind energy and contact cards for the proponent that were given to individuals who spoke with the EWP representative. The objective of the efforts was to increase the visibility and exposure of the project and to offer interested individuals more information about the project and proponent.

In addition to the public event displays, the proponent also undertook two door-to-door residential information campaigns. Homes that were visited had a EWP representative deliver newsletters and give general information about the project. Questions were answered and recorded; see the summary in Table 9. The homes visited by the proponent were located adjacent to the project location, up to 3km away from the project boundaries. A summary of the comments received during these visits is summarized in Appendix A.

TABLE 5: SUMMARY OF OUTREACH EFFORTS

Timeframe	Method	Number of People Contacted by EWP
up to end of 2011	Contacting interested individuals by phone and email from contact information gathered after first public meeting	196
2012-01-05	Odessa and District Lions Club January Monthly Meeting	10
2012-01-20	Greater Kingston Chamber of Commerce new members introduction event	18
2012-01-28	Odessa and District Lions Club Pancake Breakfast, held at the Odessa Fairgrounds during the Odessa Winter Festival	43
2012-01-28	Sustainable Kingston Forum	150
2012-02-06	Helen Henderson Care Centre presentation to residents	19
2012-02-13	Helen Henderson Care Centre presentation to residents	18
2012-02-25	Greater Kingston Chamber of Commerce Annual Member's Mixer	150
2012-02-25	Trade Roots, organized by St. Lawrence College	60
2012-03-08	Green Energy Symposium	160
2012-03-18 and 03-19	Green Profit Conference	200
2012-03-28	Napanee Chamber of Commerce Monthly Networking Meeting	25
2012-05-12	United Way Success by 6 Wolfe Island Wind Turbine Tour	30
2012-06-17	Odessa Antique and Collectible Car Show	46
2012-06-30	Bath 1812 Bicentennial Celebration	38
2012-07-14	Odessa Fair	40
Summer 2012	Door to door information campaign	257

2012-08-23, 2012-08-24	Coffee and Pie Meetings at Jiffy Grill (Odessa) and Coffee Time Plus (Amherstview)	14
---------------------------	--	----

3.4 PUBLIC MEETINGS

Four public meetings were held to present project information and engage with the public. The public meetings are summarized in Table 5, below.

TABLE 6: PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY

Date	Event	Number of People in Attendance
2010-06-29	Public Meeting 1 at the Amherstview Community Hall	50
2010-06-30	Public Meeting 2 held at the Invista Centre	10
2012-09-11	Public Meeting 3 at the Amherstview Community Hall	39
2012-09-18	Public Meeting 4 held at the Odessa Fairgrounds	98

The Public Meetings provided information about the Project through information boards that were posted on easels placed around the room. Members of the Project team were stationed at the information boards according to their area of expertise, in order to encourage conversation, answer questions regarding the Project and seek attendees' feedback regarding the Project. Participant questionnaires were available at each Public Open House; participants could fill them out at the Public Open House or take them home and mail them in at a later date.

The materials presented at these Public Meetings can be found in Appendix A, consisting of display posters, newsletters and surveys. Relevant academic and industry studies relevant to wind power and noise/health effects were also made available for attendees to review and discuss with the Project team. As required by O.Reg.359/09, copies of the draft Project Description Report were also displayed. The meetings were announced through public advertising advertising and registered mailed notices, as well as email and mass mailings. Postings in the newspaper are summarized in Table 6, below; records of published notices can be found in Appendix A.

TABLE 7: PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE PUBLICATION

Event Date	Event	Type of Notice	Date of Notice	Publication
2010-06-14	Website posting	Draft Report	2010-06-14	Draft Project Description Report
2010-06-29	Public Meeting at Amherstview Community Hall	Notice of a Proposal and Public Meeting	2010-05-29 and 2010-05-31	Kingston Whig Standard; Mass Mailing to all residences on RR3 and RR4 in the Loyalist Township

				and Notice posted on project website
2010-06-30	Public Meeting at the Invista Centre	Notice of a Proposal and Public Meeting	2010-05-29; 2010-06-03 and 2010-06-10	Mass Mailing to all residences on RR3 and RR4 in the Loyalist Township and Notice posted on project website, Published Notices in the Kingston EMC
2012-07-17	60-Day Public Viewing of Draft REA Reports	Draft REA Reports, Notices of Public Meeting	2012-07-17	Five Municipal Libraries and Two Municipal Offices
2012-09-11	Public Meeting at the Amherstview Community Hall	Notice of a Proposal and Public Meeting	2012-07-18 and 2012-07-19	Napanee Beaver, Kingston This Week, Kingston EMC, and Kingston Whig Standard
2012-09-18	Public Meeting held at the Odessa Fairgrounds	Notice of a Public Meeting	2012-07-18 and 2012-07-19	Napanee Beaver, Kingston This Week, Kingston EMC, and Kingston Whig Standard
2012-09-11 and 2012-09-18	Public Meeting at the Amherstview Community Hall and Public Meeting held at the Odessa Fairgrounds	Notice of a Proposal and Public Meeting and Notice of a Public Meeting	2012-07-18	Notices sent to all registered land owners within 550m from project location by Registered Mail
2012-09-11 and 2012-09-18	Public Meeting at the Amherstview Community Hall and Public Meeting held at the Odessa Fairgrounds	Notice of a Proposal and Public Meeting and Notice of a Public Meeting	2012-07-18	Notices posted on project website

Each Public Meeting was designed to allow guests to arrive and leave freely. Posters with information about the Ernestown Wind Park and wind energy in general were placed around the room and representatives from Ernestown Windpark Inc., Ortech Environmental, GL Garrad Hassan, Intrinsic Inc. and M.K. Ince and Associates were on hand to answer any questions that guests posed.

Attendees were encouraged to fill out voluntary surveys and questionnaires regarding their opinions about the Ernestown Wind Park and Wind Energy in general. The main concerns and comments noted

from the surveys and questionnaires are listed below (in order of frequency), followed by the responses from surveys filled out at each of the public meetings in Table 9, below.

TABLE 8: PUBLIC MEETING SURVEY RESULTS

Survey Question	Response	Public Meeting Responses	
		Meetings in 2010	Meetings in 2012
1. How did you hear about the Ernestown Wind Park Open House?	Newspaper	20%	14%
	News Media	5%	9%
	Community Ad	20%	5%
	Friend or Neighbor	12%	5%
	Direct Mail	39%	47%
	Other	4%	20%
2. Which describes your interest in the project?	Property Owner < 550m from the study area	25%	28%
	Property Owner >550m from the study area	65%	39%
	Tenant	6%	2.5%
	Government Agency	0	0
	Local Industry	2%	2.5%
	Other	2%	25%
3. Did a project representative answer your questions to your satisfaction?	Yes	36%	39%
	No	15%	39%
	Partly	49%	22%
4. Were you generally satisfied with information made available about this proposed project?	Yes	45%	41%
	No	17%	46%
	Partly	38%	13%
5. What do you feel are the most important ISSUES or CONCERNS associated with the proposed wind farm? Please circle your level of concern from 1 (least) to 5 (most): (responses shown as average values; "other" concerns shown on surveys and tallied in Table 6, shown above.)	Visual	3.43	3.37
	Noise	3.76	4.0
	Wildlife	3.81	3.98
	Construction	3.31	3.24
6. What do you feel are the most important benefits or opportunities associated with the proposed wind farm?	responses logged in Appendix A		

7. What is your view of the proposed wind farm?	Supportive	25%	30%
	Neutral	28%	10%
	Non-Supportive	31%	58%
	No Opinion	16%	2%
8. Do you have any additional comments, concerns, questions or suggestions related to the existing conditions of the proposed project?	responses logged in Appendix A		
9. Do you consent to your comments being included in the public record?	Yes	21	40
	Yes, but anonymous	9	2
	No	3	2

TABLE 9: SUMMARY OF CONCERNS

Rank	Concerns – 2010 Surveys*	Count	Concerns - Outreach	Count	Concerns – 2012 Surveys*	Count
1	Noise Impact	29	Costs to consumers / Economics	17	Visual	44
2	Wildlife	28	Potential Noise Impacts	13	Wildlife	44
3	Visual Impact	24	Health Concerns	9	Noise Impact	44
4	Construction	18	Turbine Location	8	Construction	43
5	Efficiency	1	Construction Schedule	6	Property Values	9
6	Zoning	1	Visual Impact	6	Health Concerns	8
7	Municipal Policy	1	Project Schedule	5	Well Water	7
8	Vibration	1	Property Values	4	Sound	4
9	Maintenance	1	Birds and Bats	4	Birds	4
10	Tree Removal	1	Politics	4	Layout	4
	* Note that surveys asked how important concerns were about Noise, Visual, Wildlife and Construction, with Other as an option with specification requested.		Other (over 10 topics: Wildlife, Natural Heritage, Public Consultation, Shadow Flicker, Safety, Power Grid, Transportation, Farm Activity Impacts, Setbacks, and Developer)	17	Other (over 20 topics: Use of trails, Vibration, Hearing Aids, Wind Energy, Jobs, REA process, Meeting Notification, Land Use, Bats, Turtles, Lighting, Ice Throw, Lightning, Seasonal Changes, Setbacks, Shadow Flicker, Transportation Plan, Decommissioning, Wolfe Island Studies, Electricity Prices, NHA)	31

Prior to commencing public consultation, the proponents developed a response strategy to record and address the concerns presented. Based on the concerns summarized in Table 9, above, the proponent developed responses and mitigations to these concerns. In Table 10, below, the responses and mitigations are listed. Where outstanding items require action or where project plan were changed as a result of these consultation responses, a summary is presented in Section 6 and Section 7. The responses listed above in Table 10 represent all comments and concerns raised during the public consultation period. Ernestown Windpark Inc. used an adaptive strategy in response during the consultation period where concerns and questions were considered and further investigations were conducted as required on a case by case basis.

TABLE 10: CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Comment or Concern	Response from EWP delivered in person, online and in print newsletter	How was the comment considered?
<p>Visual Impact (ex: I don't like how they look, why are they going so close to all these homes where they are the only thing we'll see)</p>	<p>The project is sited in industrial, rural, and agricultural areas in excess of all setback distances from residences and sound receptors. The sight of the proposed wind farm is subjective and is not anticipated to have negative impacts.</p>	<p>A Visual Impact Study was conducted and presented to the public 60 days before the final public meeting. Additionally, landowners living within 3km of the project location who indicated concerns were offered a visual simulation for their property. At the time this report was written, eight landowners had requested a Visual Impact Study, which will be completed in Fall 2012.</p>
<p>Wildlife Impact (ex: How do you know if the wind turbines will kill animals or affect their natural habitat?)</p>	<p>The proponent has conducted detailed Natural Heritage Assessments and investigations on wildlife. The consultants who conducted the studies have concluded that there are no substantial impacts to the wildlife or natural features in the project location or on migratory species known to frequent the area, due to lack of suitable habitat within the project location.</p>	<p>Concerned residents were given the opportunity to speak with the principal consultant of the firm which conducted the Natural Heritage Assessments to ask questions or for clarification. No new information was collected which would trigger additional studies or changes to project plans. Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>
<p>Noise Impact (ex: Will I hear these wind turbines from my home?)</p>	<p>The project is sited in industrial, rural, and agricultural areas in excess of all setback distances from residences and sound receptors. The sound of the proposed wind farm is subjective and is not anticipated to have negative impacts.</p>	<p>A Noise Impact Assessment was conducted and presented to the public 60 days before the final public meeting. Additionally, landowners living within 3km of the project location who indicated concerns were offered a Noise Impact Study for their property. At the time this report was written, four landowners had requested a Noise Impact Study, which will be completed in Fall 2012.</p>
<p>Construction Schedule / Routes (ex: When is construction and how long will it take? What roads will be used?)</p>	<p>The construction is planned to begin in late spring 2013, beginning with engineering and surveying and concluding with the erection of the wind turbines. The process will occur over approximately six months. The details of construction routing will be finalized with the Municipality in Fall 2012.</p>	<p>The proponent presented a detailed Draft Construction Plan Report and Draft Transportation Plan to the public 60 days before the final Public Meeting. At this meeting, the proponent spoke to concerns about dust, erosion, noise and traffic by explaining the standard practices that will be in place to abide by all laws and</p>

		by-laws as well as to minimize disturbances to neighbors. No new information was collected which would trigger additional studies or changes to project plans. Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.
<p>Property Values (ex: My house is going to lose most of its value because of the wind park.)</p>	<p>The research that exists in academic, peer-reviewed journals concludes that if property values are affected at all, the effect is observed during construction and rebounds post-construction.</p>	<p>Concerned parties were given an opportunity to review the cited literature and ask questions before and during the public meetings. No new information was collected which would trigger additional studies or changes to project plans. Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>
<p>Human Health (ex: I have heard that these wind farms make people sick, is this true?)</p>	<p>The research that exists in academic, peer-reviewed journals concludes that there is no scientific evidence that correlates wind turbine operation with adverse health effects. The proposed wind park is not only compliant with setback regulations, but exceeds distances where possible.</p>	<p>Concerns were addressed by providing the public with access to published research and reviews from academic journals and the opportunity to speak with an independent senior scientist whose area of focus is assessment of human health impacts. No new information was collected which would trigger additional studies or changes to project plans. Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>
<p>Well Water Quality and Availability / Changes to Existing Wells (ex: I have a dug well and am concerned that the blasting during construction will affect the quality of the water or drain the well.)</p>	<p>The regional topography indicates that the surface and ground water flows north to south towards Lake Ontario. As all residentially zoned land is located north of the project location. Additionally, the blasting zone is located within the upper 9m below grade, whereas the preliminary water studies show ground water tables to be located approximately 20m below grade. Finally, the distance from the project location to residences is large</p>	<p>Concerned land owners within approximately 2km of the project location that could be impacted were provided the opportunity to continue consultation with the proponent and pre-construction well water testing to establish a baseline prior to the commencement of construction. Additionally, the Draft Construction Plan Report was made available in writing 60 days prior to the final public meeting and the Ernestown Windpark</p>

	<p>enough to be far outside the range of influence, which is estimated by engineers to be 150m.</p>	<p>Inc. Vice President and Construction Manager was present to speak to specific issues and concerns. No new information was collected which would trigger additional studies or changes to project plans. Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>
<p>Cost to Consumers (ex: Will this project make my energy costs lower or higher?)</p>	<p>The proposed wind park is financed privately, not from any form of Government subsidy. The wind park is a small part of a larger provincial movement to replace energy from coal plants with renewable energy. The cost to consumers on their energy bill will not change in the short term, and as a result of the FIT contract's 20-year fixed price for generated electricity, as the costs of energy production rise, the rate paid for wind energy is guaranteed not rise; this is where consumers will see a noticeable difference.</p>	<p>The Vice President of Development was in attendance at the public meetings to speak to concerned residents about the economics of renewable energy as well as an independent consultant who specializes in renewable energy approvals and policies. Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>
<p>Turbine Location (ex: Why are the proposed wind turbines sited where they are?)</p>	<p>The siting of wind turbines is dependent on a number of factors, including, but not limited to: wind resources, provincial setbacks from residences and sound receptors, natural heritage features, pre-existing infrastructure setbacks, accessibility for road construction and pre-existing land uses. We worked diligently to maximize the distance of the proposed wind turbines from residences and remain in compliance with all mandated setbacks and easements from natural features.</p>	<p>The project overview was presented in the Draft Project Description, posted on the project website in 2010 and revised in print and online in 2012 to discuss the general features of the site and summarize the regulatory requirements of the O.Reg. 359/09. Additionally, the siting process was described in writing and in person at the final public meeting. No new information was collected which would trigger additional studies or changes to project plans. Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>
<p>Birds and Bats (ex: how many birds or bats will be killed by the turbines?)</p>	<p>The natural heritage features of the project location identified the types of habitat that is potentially used by birds and bats. The conclusion, based on these studies is that there is only a</p>	<p>In addition to the Draft Natural Heritage Assessment that was made available to the public more than 60 days before the final public meeting, a Draft Post-Construction Bird and Bat</p>

	<p>small amount of potentially significant habitat for birds or bats. The possibility of migratory bird mortality is slim based on the lack of habitat for these species to use as stop-over and the pre-existing land uses being potentially disruptive to birds, such as farming machinery and quarry blasting. There is no significant bat roosting habitat in the project location; therefore the studies concluded that the likelihood of significant mortality is negligible.</p>	<p>Monitoring Plan was published with the draft REA reports. Concerned residents were given the opportunity to speak with the principal consultant of the firm which conducted the Natural Heritage Assessments to ask questions or for clarification. No new information was collected which would trigger additional studies or changes to project plans. Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>
<p>Municipal Policy (ex: Why are wind farms allowed to be on residential lands? What authority does the Municipality have in the development of the wind farm?)</p>	<p>The Municipality of Loyalist Township supports the Ernestown Wind Park plans and previously stated that the project was sited in areas deemed appropriate for wind development, based on the Municipal Official Plan Amendment to develop a “green” industrial park by expanding the pre-existing industrial lands and incorporating renewable energy projects, including wind energy. The lands that the proposed wind park is situated on are rural-residential and industrially zoned, which is lawful per Green Energy Act.</p>	<p>The Vice President of Development was in attendance at the public meetings to speak to concerned residents about the Green Energy Act, as well as an independent consultant who specializes in renewable energy approvals and policies. Information about legal jurisdiction and scope of consultation was discussed. Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>
<p>Tree Removal (ex: how many trees are being removed and how will the developer make up for the loss of trees?)</p>	<p>The plan for construction and transportation of materials and components outside of the Project Location is not anticipated to result in tree removal. If any trees are removed from public lands, the trees will be replaced at the discretion of the Loyalist Township and Ernestown Windpark Inc. The trees removed within the project location during construction will be replaced at the landowner’s discretion following the decommissioning of the project.</p>	<p>The Draft Construction Plan and Draft Decommissioning Plan were provided online and in print 60 days before the final public meeting. During the final public meetings, the lead consultant speaking to the environmental impacts of the project discussed the impact of the tree removal and confirmed that rehabilitation of the area post-construction and post-decommissioning would be reasonable and no permanent impacts were anticipated. Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>

<p>Vibrations (ex: what vibrations will be felt outdoors and inside my home?)</p>	<p>No vibrations are anticipated to be present during operation of the wind park due to normal operations.</p>	<p>Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>
<p>Maintenance (ex: What is the maintenance schedule and what takes place?)</p>	<p>The normal maintenance schedule will have a technician on-site at least once monthly to conduct a visual inspection and any outstanding technical work which is required in the normal operations of the turbines. During the 20-year life of the project the access roads and crane pads will be maintained and kept clear for the safety and accessibility of the technicians.</p>	<p>The Draft Design and Operations Report was prepared and made available to the public in print and online 60 days before the final public meeting. Additionally, at the final public meetings, the Ernestown Windpark Inc. Construction Manager was available to speak in detail about the operational activities of the wind park. Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>
<p>Ice Throw (ex: I am concerned that ice will form on the turbines during the winter and fly off, creating a threat to my safety and property)</p>	<p>The Enercon Turbines which will be commissioned for the Ernestown Wind Park were designed to have heated blades that prevent the formation of ice. As such, the issue of ice throw is not a concern for this project.</p>	<p>Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>
<p>Lightning (ex: I do not want lightning to come closer and hit my home because of the proximity of the turbines.)</p>	<p>The wind park is sited in excess of all mandated setbacks under the O.Reg. 359/09. The turbines are designed to withstand lightning strikes during operation without damage and are grounded to channel current into the ground. The likelihood of a lightning strike is likely less near a wind turbine with the presence of a grounded structure significantly taller than residences.</p>	<p>Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>
<p>Seasonal Changes (ex: how does the wind and noise from the wind park change through the seasons?)</p>	<p>Our wind resource analysis on this project and others that we have conducted in other Canadian projects concluded that typically wind speeds are higher and more constant in the winter and lower throughout the summer. As a result, the sounds emanating from the turbines will scale up and down with the speed of operation. Independent consultants</p>	<p>A Noise Impact Assessment was conducted and presented to the public 60 days before the final public meeting. Additionally, landowners living within 3km of the project location who indicated concerns were offered a Noise Impact Study for their property. At the time this report was written, four landowners had requested a Visual Impact Study, which</p>

	<p>conducted a Noise Impact Assessment in 2012 for the Ernestown Wind Park and found that the sound levels for all residences and vacant lots were well within regulated limits at all times of the year at predicted wind speeds.</p>	<p>will be completed in Fall 2012.</p>
<p>Decommissioning (ex: what happens when the project contract is up? Who pays to take everything away?)</p>	<p>At the end of the 20-year FIT contract, the Ernestown Wind Park may be refurbished and a new contract incited, but if it is decided to end the project, the process for decommissioning the wind park is the same process for construction, but in reverse. Ernestown Windpark Inc. will be responsible for financing the project if they continue to hold ownership. The components from the turbines are valuable in materials that can be recycled by many industries. The process takes six months or less and is followed by habitat restoration at the discretion of the land owner and the proponent.</p>	<p>The Draft Decommissioning Report was prepared and made available to the public in print and online 60 days before the final public meeting. Additionally, at the final public meetings, the Ernestown Windpark Inc. Construction Manager was available to speak in detail about the decommissioning activities of the wind park. Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>
<p>Shadow Flicker (ex: how far away does shadow flicker fall and does it cause health problems?)</p>	<p>Ernestown Windpark Inc. has not developed a formal public shadow flicker analysis; however, we do understand that there are concerns about the health effects of these moving shadows. What we do know is that the rising and setting sun will cast shadows on an east-west track. Some residents may experience brief periods of shadow flicker, but in terms of the health effects of shadow flicker, the academic research available concludes that there is no evidence that shadow flicker causes adverse health effects.</p>	<p>Concerns were addressed by providing the public with access to published research and reviews from academic journals and the opportunity to speak with an independent senior scientist whose area of focus is assessment of human health impacts. Additionally, concerned citizens who requested a shadow flicker study for their property were consulted on a personal basis and offered a site-specific analysis for their property. At the time of the writing of this report, only two people have requested shadow flicker analyses. No new information was collected which would trigger additional studies or changes to project plans. Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>
<p>Impacts on Farming (ex: what are the potential impacts on</p>	<p>At present we are unaware of any scientific research that has been conducted on this issue. We take some</p>	<p>Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have</p>

<p>livestock productivity or yields)</p>	<p>comfort in the fact that there are thousands of turbines across Europe, Australia and the United States and this issue does not appear to have surfaced around these existing facilities, some of which have been in operation for decades.</p>	<p>additional questions or concerns.</p>
<p>Notices (ex: When was the public notified of the project and meetings held to inform the community?)</p>	<p>In 2010, more than 700 notices were sent out via Canada Post and were published in the Kingston Whig-Standard, EMC, Kingston this Week and Napanee Beaver, as well as on the project website. In 2012, notices were sent to the 53 registered land owners within 550m of the project location on two occasions. A mass mailing was sent to 689 to land owners and residents within 3 km of the project via first class mail as well as notices were published in the Kingston Whig-Standard, EMC, Kingston this Week, Napanee Beaver and the project website. Ernestown Windpark's Community Relations Manager and Project Coordinators hand delivered notices, newsletters and printed updates to more than 100 homes on multiple occasions, as well as holding information booths throughout the summer at local events.</p>	<p>Concerns were noted and residents were given contact information for the proponent in case they should have additional questions or concerns.</p>

4.0 ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION

The purpose of consultation is to determine whether an Aboriginal or treaty right will be potentially negatively impacted by the proposal, or whether Aboriginal communities have an interest in a project.

The methods employed by Ernestown for consultation include:

- Direct engagement of the community through meetings, phone calls, letters, emails, guided site visits, field studies, presentations, community meetings;
- Notify Aboriginal communities with notices required under the REA process;
- Notify communities of open houses and meetings and invitations to those meetings;
- Provide communities with project documentation and other project information; and
- Legal reviews, research on land claims, existing treaties.

In accordance with regulations, on October 13, 2010, the Ministry of Environment (“MOE”) provided Ernestown Windpark Inc. Inc., with a list of Aboriginal Communities which:

- i) have or may have constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty rights that may be adversely impacted by the project; or
- ii) May otherwise be interested in any negative environmental effects of the project.

The nine groups contained in the Director’s list were as follows:

- 1) Alderville First Nation
- 2) Hiawatha First Nation
- 3) Curve Lake First Nation
- 4) Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation
- 5) Kawartha Nishnawbee First Nation
- 6) Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte (Tyendinaga Mohawks)
- 7) Northumberland Métis Council
- 8) Seven Rivers Métis Council
- 9) Métis Nation of Ontario

Relevant correspondence with the Ministry of Environment is included in Appendix B of this report.

4.1 DISTRIBUTION OF NOTICES AND PROJECT REPORTS

4.1.1 DISTRIBUTION OF DRAFT PROJECT DESCRIPTION REPORT

On December 15th, 2010, an information package was sent to each Aboriginal community in the above list, containing:

- 1) A Draft Project Description Report
- 2) An introductory letter from Ernestown Wind Park:

- inviting the community to meet and learn about the project
- stating that, based on the assessment performed to date, no adverse impacts to Aboriginal or treaty rights are anticipated from the proposed project
- requesting any information the community has that, in its opinion, should be considered the described reports, particularly with respect to adverse impacts the project may have on constitutionally protected Aboriginal treaty rights and any measures for mitigating those impacts
- requesting the information in writing so that it can be considered into the design and planning for this project

The information was sent to each community's main point of contact, provided in the MOE's Aboriginal Consultation List.

TABLE 11: DATES AND ADDRESSEE OF PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND WRITTEN REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

Community	Recipient	Date Sent
Alderville First Nation	Chief James Marsden PO Box 46 Rosenewath, Ontario K0K 2X0	December 15, 2010 by Canada Post Registered Mail
Hiawatha First Nation	Diane Sheridan RR #2 Keene, Ontario. K0L 2G0	December 15, 2010 by Canada Post Registered Mail
Curve Lake First Nation	Krista Coppaway Mississaugas of Mud Lake Curve Lake FN 35 and 35A General Delivery Curve Lake, Ontario K0L 1R0	December 15, 2010 by Canada Post Registered Mail
Kawartha Nishnawbee First Nation	Kris Nahrgang PO Box 1432 Lakefield, Ontario K0L 2H0	December 15, 2010 by Canada Post Registered Mail
Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation	Murray Maracle 22521 Island Road Port Perry, Ontario. L9L 1B6	December 15, 2010 by Canada Post Registered Mail
Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte	Chief Don Maracle RR#1. Deseronto, Ontario. K0K 1X0	December 15, 2010 by Canada Post Registered Mail
Northumberland Métis Council	Wayne Trudeau 140 Elder Rd. RR #4 Roseneath, Ontario. K0K 2X0	December 15, 2010 by Canada Post Registered Mail
Seven Rivers Métis Council	Tom Thompson Box 74 Northbrook, Ontario	December 15, 2010 by Canada Post Registered Mail

	N0H2G0	
Métis Nation of Ontario	Consultation Unit 500 Old Patrick St. Unit 3, Ottawa, ON. K1N 9G4	December 15, 2010 by Canada Post Registered Mail

Evidence of notification is found in Appendix B.

4.1.2 DISTRIBUTION OF SUMMARIES TO ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

On June 27th 2012, Summaries of the Draft REA reports were provided to each Aboriginal Community, including:

- A summary of each document required as part of the REA application;
- An updated draft Project Description Report
- Any information the applicant may have on any potential adverse impacts the project may have on Aboriginal or treaty rights
- A request asking the Aboriginal community to provide in writing:
 - Any information available to them that should be considered when preparing the project documentation;
 - Any information the community may have about any potential adverse impacts on their Aboriginal or treaty rights; and
 - Any suggested measures for avoiding, minimizing or mitigating potential adverse impacts.

TABLE 12: DATES AND ADDRESSEE OF REA REPORT SUMMARIES AND WRITTEN REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

Community	Recipient	Date Sent
Alderville First Nation	Dave Simpson 11696 Second Line Rosenewath Ontario. K0K2X0	June 27, 2012 by Canada Post Registered Mail
Hiawatha First Nation	Diane Sheridan RR #2 Keene, Ontario. K0L 2G0	June 27, 2012 by Canada Post Registered Mail
Curve Lake First Nation	Krista Coppaway Mississaugas of Mud Lake Curve Lake FN 35 and 35A General Delivery Curve Lake, Ontario K0L 1R0	June 27, 2012 by Canada Post Registered Mail
Kawartha Nishnawbee First	Kris Nahrgang General Delivery	June 27, 2012 by Canada Post Registered Mail

Nation	Burleigh Falls, Ontario. K0L 2H0	
Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation	Murray Maracle 22521 Island Road Port Perry, Ontario. L9L 1B6	June 27, 2012 by Canada Post Registered Mail
Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte	Chief Don Maracle RR#1 Deseronto, Ontario. K0K 1X0	June 27, 2012 by Canada Post Registered Mail
Northumberland Métis Council	Wayne Trudeau 140 Elder Rd. RR #4 Roseneath, Ontario. K0K 2X0	June 27, 2012 by Canada Post Registered Mail
Seven Rivers Métis Council	Tom Thompson 860 Kennebec Road North Brook, Ontario. K0H 2G0	June 27, 2012 by Canada Post Registered Mail
Métis Nation of Ontario	Melanie Paradis and James Wagar 500 Old Patrick St. Unit 3, Ottawa, ON. K1N 9G4	June 27, 2012 by Canada Post Registered Mail

4.1.3 DISTRIBUTION OF DRAFT REA DOCUMENTS TO ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES

On July 17th, 2012, Ernestown provided each Aboriginal community with paper copies of all the draft REA reports that are to form part of the application and a copy of the notice to the final public meeting.

TABLE 13: DATES AND ADDRESSEE OF REA REPORT SUMMARIES AND WRITTEN REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

Community	Recipient	Date Sent
Alderville First Nation	Dave Simpson 11696 Second Line Rosenewath Ontario. K0K2X0	July 17, 2012 by FedEx
Hiawatha First Nation	Diane Sheridan RR #2 Keene, Ontario. K0L 2G0	July 17, 2012 by FedEx
Curve Lake First Nation	Krista Coppaway Mississaugas of Mud Lake Curve Lake FN 35 and 35A General Delivery Curve Lake, Ontario K0L 1R0	July 17, 2012 by FedEx
Kawartha Nishnawbee First Nation	Kris Nahrgang General Delivery Burleigh Falls, Ontario. K0L 2H0	July 17, 2012 by FedEx
Mississaugas of Scugog Island First	Murray Maracle 22521 Island Road	July 17, 2012 by FedEx

Nation	Port Perry, Ontario. L9L 1B6	
Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte	Chief Don Maracle RR#1 Deseronto, Ontario. K0K 1X0	July 17, 2012 by FedEx
Northumberland Métis Council	Wayne Trudeau 140 Elder Rd. RR #4 Roseneath, Ontario. K0K 2X0	July 17, 2012 by FedEx
Seven Rivers Métis Council	Tom Thompson 860 Kennebec Road North Brook, Ontario. K0H 2G0	July 17, 2012 by FedEx
Métis Nation of Ontario	Melanie Paradis and James Wagar 500 Old Patrick St. Unit 3, Ottawa, ON. K1N 9G4	July 17, 2012 by FedEx

4.2 ALDERVILLE FIRST NATION

TABLE 14: SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATIONS WITH ALDERVILLE FIRST NATION

Date	Participants	Description
13-Dec-10	Letter from Jean Francois Daoust, Project Manager to Chief James Marsden	Sent a Notice of Project consultation, project description and a copy of the Public Notice of proposal
21-Jan-11	Email from Jean Francois Daoust, Project Manager to Chief James Marsden	Follow up e-mail to invite the First Nation to a meeting
26-Jan-11	Dave Simpson, Lands and Resources Communications Officer to Jean Francois Daoust, Project Manager	Letter indicating that the project is deemed a "level 3, having minimal potential to impact our First Nations' rights". Alderville wishes to be kept apprised of the project progress.
9-Jan-12	Meeting between the Chief and Council of Alderville First Nation and Ernestown representatives Nhung Nguyen and John Kim Bell	A presentation was given to Chief and Council about the project. The presentation provided information on: 1) the proponent and project history; 2) an overview of the project; 3) an outline of the REA process; 4) the consultation efforts that have been undertaken to date; and 5) a progress update on the work that has been done and work still outstanding.
21-Jun-12	Letter from Nhung Nguyen to Chief and Council and Dave Simpson	Letter sent, providing a copy of the draft Project Description Report, written summary of the REA reports, and a written request for any information the community may have with respect to Aboriginal or Treaty rights.
17-Jul-12	Draft REA reports sent	Ernestown provided the community with paper copies of all the draft REA reports that are to form part of the REA application and a copy of the notice to the final public meeting.
10-Sep-12	Meeting between the Chief and Council of Alderville First Nation and Ernestown representatives Nhung Nguyen and John Kim Bell	Alderville asserts that the site of the Ernestown Wind Park is on Alderville traditional lands and consequently Alderville is asserting an interest in the project. JKB responded that based on the research conducted, prior treaties referenced by Alderville were likely peace and friendship treaties that conveyed no rights. The parties agreed to find a path to work together.
14-Sep-12	Letter from Chief James Marsden to the Ministry of Environment, copying Ernestown Wind Park	Letter states that "AFN has no objections to the project which is located in our traditional territory and have asserted interest and are entering into discussions with Ernestown Wind Park LP which will be ongoing".

4.3 CURVE LAKE FIRST NATION

TABLE 15: SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATIONS WITH CURVE LAKE FIRST NATION

Date	Participants	Description
13-Dec-10	Letter from Jean Francois Daoust, Project Manager to Chief Keith Knott	Sent a Notice of Project consultation, project description and a copy of the Public Notice of proposal
4-Jan-11	Letter from Chief Keith Knott to Jean Francois Daoust, Project Manager	Responded with a letter stating that the project is located within the Traditional Territory of Curve Lake First Nation. "The Curve Lake First Nation Council is not currently aware of any issues that would cause concern with respect to our Traditional, Aboriginal and Treaty rights." The letter requests that the community be notified should any new, undisclosed or unforeseen issues arise, and further stated that the Chief and Council do not feel there is a need to meet.
11-Jan-11	Email from Jean Francois Daoust to Sandy Mackenzie, Williams Treaty First Nation Claims Coordinator	Per the recommendation of Chief Keith Knott, project information was forwarded to Ms. Mackenzie.
16-Dec-12	Email from Michelle Rice, Assistant to John Kim Bell	Sent email requesting meeting with John Kim Bell, Senior Aboriginal Affairs Advisor to Ernestown Wind Park.
19-Dec-11	Email from Krista Coppaway & Melissa Dokis, Consultation Officers for Curve Lake First Nation to Michelle Rice	Email stating that they would meet after the holidays and request relevant information about project
20-Dec-11	Email from John Kim Bell, Senior Aboriginal Affairs Advisor to Krista Coppaway	Request for a meeting to discuss the project
4-Jan-12	Email from Melissa Dokis to John Kim Bell	Email stated that after discussions with both Curve Lake First Nation's Chief and General Manager, Curve Lake First Nation is not interested in meeting on the project as the Ernestown Wind park is outside of the community's treaty territory. The First Nation does not wish to comment on the Ernestown Wind Park or make any statements that may have an impression on any other First Nations which may be directly affected by this development. Curve Lake First Nation wishes to be notified on any future proposed undertakings.
21-Jun-12	Letter from Nhung Nguyen, VP Development to Chief and Council	Letter sent, providing a copy of the draft Project Description Report, written summary of the REA reports, and a written request for any information the community may have with respect to Aboriginal or Treaty rights.
19-Jul-12	Letter from Chief Phyllis Williams to Nhung Nguyen	Letter reconfirms the statements of the Jan 4, 2011 letter from Curve Lake, that Curve Lake First Nation

		Council is not currently aware of any issues that would cause concern with respect to the community's Traditional, Aboriginal and Treaty rights.
17-Jul-12	Draft REA reports sent	Ernestown provided the community with paper copies of all the draft REA reports that are to form part of the REA application and a copy of the notice to the final public meeting.

4.4 HIAWATHA FIRST NATION

TABLE 16: SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATIONS WITH HIAWATHA FIRST NATION

Date	Participants	Description
13-Dec-10	Letter from Jean Francois Daoust, Project Manager to Chief Greg Cowie	Sent a Notice of Project consultation, project description and a copy of the Public Notice of proposal
21-Jan-11	Email from Jean Francois Daoust to Chief Greg Cowie	Follow up email inviting the First Nation to a meeting
28-Feb-11	Email from Jean Francois Daoust to Interim Chief Greg Cowie	Follow up email inviting the First Nation to a meeting
4-Jan-12	Email from John Kim Bell, Senior Aboriginal Affairs Advisor to Chief Sandra Moore	Provided a copy of the project description report
5-Jan-12	Meeting between Ernestown and Hiawatha representatives	A presentation was given to Chief and Council about the project. The presentation provided information on: 1) the proponent and project history; 2) an overview of the project; 3) an outline of the REA process; 4) the consultation efforts that have been undertaken to date; and 5) a progress update on the work that has been done and work still outstanding. In terms of asserting an impact on HFN, it was cited that HFN's traditional territory is defined by the Williams Treaty and that the boundary did not extend to the proposed site of the Ernestown Wind Park. Consequently, no assertion is being made by HFN that there is an impact on HFN and therefore no benefit is being sought by HFN.
5-Jan-12	Letter from Diane Sheridan, Land Resource Worker for Consultation to Nhung Nguyen, VP Development	Letter sent to thank Ernestown for the informative presentation and giving additional contacts.
21-Jun-12	Letter from Nhung Nguyen to Chief and Council	Letter sent, providing a copy of the draft Project Description Report, written summary of the REA reports, and a written request for any information the community may have with respect to Aboriginal or Treaty rights.
17-Jul-12	Draft REA reports sent	Ernestown provided the community with paper copies of all the draft REA reports that are to form part of the REA application and a copy of the notice to the final public meeting.
6-Sep-12	Letter from Lori Ritter and Diane Sheridan, Land Resource Workers to	Letter states: "As per the Hiawatha First Nation Consultation Protocol, your proposed project is

	John Kim Bell	deemed, having minimal potential to impact Hiawatha First Nation's rights at this time, however, please keep us apprised of any updates, archaeological findings, and/or of any environmental impacts, should any occur."
--	---------------	---

4.5 KAWARTHA NISHNAWBE FIRST NATION

TABLE 17: SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATIONS WITH KAWARTHA NISHNAWBE FIRST NATION

Date	Participants	Description
13-Dec-10	Letter from Jean Francois Daoust, Project Manager	Sent a Notice of Project consultation, project description and a copy of the Public Notice of proposal
4-Jan-12	Email from Chief Kris Nahrgang to John Kim Bell, Senior Aboriginal Affairs Advisor c/o Michelle Rice, Assistant to John Kim Bell	Email states that the Chief is not taking meetings as the community has no funding to do so. Their concerns are infringements upon hunting and fishing right and if there are any issues of archaeology to be dealt with. Unless these issues are present, we are not wishing to be involved at this time.
17-Jan-12	Phone conversation between Chief Kris Nahrgang and John Kim Bell	The Chief indicates that Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation is part of the Williams Treaty and that the boundaries of that treaty do not extend to the Bay of Quinte. Ernestown is not required to consult with them.
21-Jun-12	Letter from Nhung Nguyen to Chief and Council	Letter sent, providing a copy of the draft Project Description Report, written summary of the REA reports, and a written request for any information the community may have with respect to Aboriginal or Treaty rights.
17-Jul-12	Draft REA reports sent	Ernestown provided the community with paper copies of all the draft REA reports that are to form part of the REA application and a copy of the notice to the final public meeting.
30-Aug-12	Courier package from Nhung Nguyen to Chief Kris Nahrgang	The REA Draft report binder was resent to the Chief.
11-Sep-12	Letter from Chief Kris Nahrgang to John Kim Bell.	Letter states "After careful review of the information for the Ernestown Wind Park Project Revised 2012-05-25, I find that there are no areas of concern for our Community, Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation of Burleigh Falls ... If any archaeological issues arise during construction, that we would like to be notified at that time... the amount of work done to make sure all areas of concern were met is thorough, and I have found nothing that would offer issues for our community, and no further contact, unless something arises in the future for this project, are necessary. Therefore at this time, I feel that all concerns for our Community have been met..."

4.6 MISSISSAUGAS OF SCUGOG ISLAND FIRST NATION

TABLE 18: SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE MISSISSAUGAS OF SCUGOG ISLAND FIRST NATION

Date	Participants	Description
13-Dec-10	Letter from Jean Francois Daoust, Project Manager to Chief Tracey Gauthier	Sent a Notice of Project consultation, project description and a copy of the Public Notice of proposal
21-Jan-12	Email from Jean Francois Daoust to Chief Tracey Gauthier	Follow up email to invite the First Nation to a meeting
28-Feb-11	Email from Jean Francois Daoust to Chief Tracey Gauthier	Follow up email to invite the First Nation to a meeting
26-Jan-12	Meeting between Ernestown and representatives of Scugog Island First Nation	A presentation was given about the project. The presentation provided information on: 1) the proponent and project history; 2) an overview of the project; 3) an outline of the REA process; 4) the consultation efforts that have been undertaken to date; and 5) a progress update on the work that has been done and work still outstanding.
21-Jun-12	Letter from Nhung Nguyen to Chief and Council	Letter sent, providing a copy of the draft Project Description Report, written summary of the REA reports, and a written request for any information the community may have with respect to Aboriginal or Treaty rights.
17-Jul-12	Draft REA reports sent	Ernestown provided the community with paper copies of all the draft REA reports that are to form part of the REA application and a copy of the notice to the final public meeting.
14-Sep-12	Letter from Murray Maracle, Community Consultation Specialist to John Kim Bell, Senior Advisor of Aboriginal Affairs	Letter stated that “the Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation have no concerns or further comments regarding the Ernestown Wind Park as it has been presented to us to date.” The letter requests that the community be notified immediately should any significant changes be made to the proposed project or if any archaeological resources are uncovered during construction.

4.7 MOHAWKS OF THE BAY OF QUINTE

TABLE 19: SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE MOHAWKS OF THE BAY OF QUINTE

Date	Participants	Description
13-Dec-10	Letter from Jean Francois Daoust, Project Manager to Chief Donald Maracle	Sent a Notice of Project consultation, project description and a copy of the Public Notice of proposal
21-Jan-11	Email from Jean Francois Daoust to Chief Donald Maracle	Follow up email inviting the community to a meeting
28-Feb-11	Email from Jean Francois Daoust to Chief Donald Maracle	Follow up email inviting the community to a meeting
17-Dec-11	Email from John Kim Bell, Senior Aboriginal Affair Advisor to Chief Donald Maracle	A written request was sent to Chief Don Maracle requesting a meeting. A friendly response was provided but the Chief did not confirm a meeting time.
19-Dec-11	Phone call between John Kim Bell and Chief Donald Maracle	JKB proposed a meeting to discuss the project. The Chief suggested that a meeting this week would be premature because the election of new Councillors takes place Wednesday and the band simply isn't meeting with anyone until after the holidays.
10-Jan-12	Phone call between John Kim Bell and Kristin Maracle, Environment Services Officer	Kristin indicated that the band administration is going through some restructuring. The Chief would likely see Ernestown either in the first or second week of February.
17-Feb-12	Phone call between John Kim Bell and Bonnie Thompson, assistant to Chief Donald Maracle	Ernestown will likely be on the agenda scheduled for the second week in March.. This is the fiscal year-end for all Aboriginal organizations and they are currently construction their budget for the coming year. The Chief is aware of Ernestown's request to meet and he has suggested the second week in March.
24-Feb-12	Email from John Kim Bell to Kristin Maracle	JKB requested again to meet with the Chief and Council. He explained that he has been trying to secure a meeting since November. Kristin apologizes and explains that they have limited staff. Ernestown's meeting request will be placed on the March 7th council agenda.
on or about 11-Apr-12	Email from John Kim Bell to Kristin Maracle	John Kim Bell forwards a proposed consultation plan and invites input and comments.
16-May-12	Phone call between John Kim Bell and Dan Brant, Chief Administrative Officer	John Kim Bell speaks with Dan Brant, the future Chief Administrative Officer for MBQ. JKB explains that it has been difficult to engage. Dan

		confirmed he will arrange a presentation with the Chief and Council once he assumes his new position on June 4.
23-May-12	Letter from Nhung Nguyen, VP Development to Chief and Council	Letter sent, providing a copy of the draft Project Description Report, written summary of the REA reports, and a written request for any information the community may have with respect to Aboriginal or Treaty rights.
20-Jun-12	Meeting between Chief and Council of MBQ and Ernestown representatives Nhung Nguyen and John Kim Bell	<p>A presentation was given about the project. The presentation provided information on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the proponent and project history; 2) an overview of the project; 3) an outline of the REA process; 4) the consultation efforts that have been undertaken to date; and 5) a progress update on the work that has been done and work still outstanding. <p>The Chief directed Ernestown to work with Kristin Maracle and Dan Brant on the proposed consultation plan and return to consult with the community.</p>
17-Jul-12	Draft REA reports sent	Ernestown provided the community with paper copies of all the draft REA reports that are to form part of the REA application and a copy of the notice to the final public meeting.
4-Sep-12	Letter from Dan Brant to John Kim Bell	The letter states that the Chief and Council of the Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte have reviewed the Draft Consultation agreement dated July 31, 2012 and have agreed to enter into a consultation protocol with the company regarding its proposed Ernestown Wind Park project. As per the process outlined in the agreement, MBQ will begin the consultation process in good faith. A copy of the agreed consultation plan was included with the letter.
10-Sep-12	Meeting between the consultation committee of MBQ and Ernestown representatives Nhung Nguyen and John Kim Bell	<p>A presentation was given to the MBQ consultation committee on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) history of the project and company 2) the Renewable Energy Approvals process and major milestones completed 3) the project layout 4) a visual impact study and photos of the site 5) the community engagement program 6) the turbine supplier 7) findings from archaeology and cultural

		<p>heritage studies</p> <p>The presentation was followed by a short video showing how a turbine is constructed, and a question and answer session.</p>
18-Sep-12	Open house held by MBQ consultation committee for community members	<p>Open house held for community members at the Kanhiote Library from 11am-2pm and 6pm-8pm. MBQ representatives will have the draft REA reports for the community's review and accept questions/concerns to be answered at a community meeting. Notices were distributed by the MBQ consultation committee. It was reported by the MBQ consultation committee that approximately 3 community members attended.</p>
22-Sep-12	Ernestown booth on display at the Mohawk Agricultural Fair	<p>Ernestown representatives John Kim Bell, Nhung Nguyen, and Melody Tomkow held a booth at the fair. Staff was on hand to inform attendees about the project, answer questions, and collect comments. The project's Draft Renewable Energy Approval report was available, and comment sheets were available to document concerns and questions. None were documented.</p>
27-Sep-12	Community meeting	<p>A community meeting consultation meeting was held by Ernestown Wind Park at the Mohawk Community Center from 7-9pm. 6 community members attended. The draft REA report was available for viewing, along with posters and project information. A round table question and answer session was held. Comments and survey forms were filled out and included in Appendix B.</p> <p>Consultation with the Mohawk Bay of Quinte community will be ongoing.</p>

4.8 MÉTIS NATION OF ONTARIO

TABLE 20: SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE MÉTIS NATION OF ONTARIO

Date	Participants	Description
13-Dec-10	Letter from Jean Francois Daoust, Project Manager to the Consultation Unit at the Métis Nation of Ontario	Sent a Notice of Project consultation, project description and a copy of the Public Notice of proposal
15-Dec-10	Email from Melanie Paradis, Director of Lands, Resources and Consultation to Jean Francois Daoust	Email from Melanie Paradis indicates that James Wagar, Consultation Coordinator will forward the project information provided to the potentially affected communities for their review and consideration.
28-Feb-11	Email from Jean Francois Daoust to Melanie Paradis and James Wagar	Email inviting the community to a meeting to discuss the project.
10-Mar-11	Letter from James Wagar to Jean Francois Daoust	The MNO and the regionally based Consultation Committee believe that should the project proceed there would be no immediate adverse impacts to Métis rights, culture or way of life.
21-Jun-12	Letter from Nhung Nguyen to James Wagar and Melanie Paradis	Letter sent, providing a copy of the draft Project Description Report, written summary of the REA reports, and a written request for any information the community may have with respect to Aboriginal or Treaty rights.
17-Jul-12	Draft REA reports sent	Ernestown provided the community with paper copies of all the draft REA reports that are to form part of the REA application and a copy of the notice to the final public meeting.
14-Sep-12	Letter from James Wagar to Nhung Nguyen	Letter confirms, on behalf of the regionally based Consultation Committee that “Based on the information provided ... the MNO and the regionally based Consultation Committee believe that should the project proceed there would be no immediate adverse impacts to Métis rights, culture or way of life”

4.9 NORTHUMBERLAND MÉTIS COUNCIL

TABLE 21: SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATIONS NORTHUMBERLAND MÉTIS COUNCIL

Date	Participants	Description
13-Dec-10	Letter from Jean Francois Daoust, Project Manager to President Wayne Trudeau (letter was not picked up by recipient)	Sent a Notice of Project consultation, project description and a copy of the Public Notice of proposal
11-Jan-12	Email from Jean Francois Daoust to President Wayne Trudeau	Email requesting confirmation of the correct mailing address
20-Jan-12	Letter from Jean Francois Daoust to President Wayne Trudeau	Attempted to resend the Dec 12, 2010 package. Letter was unclaimed and returned again.
28-Feb-12	Email from Jean Francois Daoust to President Wayne Trudeau	Follow up email requesting a meeting with the community.
28-Feb-12	Email from President Wayne Trudeau to Jean Francois Daoust	Email from Wayne Trudeau indicating he is no longer President of the Council. Ernestown should now refer to James Wagar from the Metis Nation of Ontario Lands & Resources Branch.
03-Mar-12	Email from Jean Francois Daoust to James Wagar, Supervisor of Lands, Resources and Consultation for the Métis Nation of Ontario	Email to James Wagar explaining that Wayne Trudeau recommended that Ernestown communicate with the Métis Nation of Ontario for matters concerning consultation with the Northumberland Métis Council.
10-Mar-12	Email and letter from James Wagar to Jean Francois Daoust	James confirms that, in respect of the project, the proper councils and personnel have been notified and regularly following up with the MNO satisfies communications at this point. A letter is included in the email which confirms that "Based on the information provided ... the MNO and the regionally based Consultation Committee believe that should the project proceed there would be no immediate adverse impacts to Métis rights, culture or way of life"
21-Jun-12	Letter from Nhung Nguyen to President and Council	Letter sent, providing a copy of the draft Project Description Report, written summary of the REA reports, and a written request for any information the community may have with respect to Aboriginal or Treaty rights.
17-Jul-12	Draft REA reports sent	Ernestown provided the community with paper copies of all the draft REA reports that are to form part of the REA application and a copy of the notice to the final public meeting.
14-Sep-12	Letter from James Wagar to Nhung Nguyen	Letter confirms, on behalf of the regionally based Consultation Committee that "Based on

	the information provided ... the MNO and the regionally based Consultation Committee believe that should the project proceed there would be no immediate adverse impacts to Métis rights, culture or way of life”
--	---

4.10 SEVEN RIVERS MÉTIS COUNCIL

TABLE 22: SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATIONS WITH SEVEN RIVERS MÉTIS COUNCIL

Date	Participants	Description
13-Dec-10	Letter from Jean Francois Daoust, Project Manager to President Tom Thompson Jr	Sent a Notice of Project consultation, project description and a copy of the Public Notice of proposal
21-Jan-11	Email from Jean Francois Daoust to President Tom Thompson Jr.	Follow up email inviting the community to a consultation meeting
28-Feb-11	Email from Jean Francois Daoust to President Tom Thompson Jr.	Follow up email inviting the community to a consultation meeting
3-Mar-11	Phone calls between Jean Francois Daoust, Edward Lloyd, and Tom Thompson's secretary	Mr. Lloyd is now past president. Ernestown needs to contact Mr. Tom Thompson. A message was left with Mr. Thompson's secretary. No response was received from Mr. Thompson's office.
21-Jun-12	Letter from Nhung Nguyen to President and Council	Letter sent, providing a copy of the draft Project Description Report, written summary of the REA reports, and a written request for any information the community may have with respect to Aboriginal or Treaty rights.
17-Jul-12	Draft REA reports sent	Ernestown provided the community with paper copies of all the draft REA reports that are to form part of the REA application and a copy of the notice to the final public meeting.
14-Sep-12	Letter from James Wagar to Nhung Nguyen	Letter confirms, on behalf of the regionally based Consultation Committee that "Based on the information provided ... the MNO and the regionally based Consultation Committee believe that should the project proceed there would be no immediate adverse impacts to Métis rights, culture or way of life"

4.11 SUMMARY OF MEASURES FOR MITIGATING ANY ADVERSE IMPACTS

Below is a summary of the comments and concerns raised by each community at the time of writing of this report, as well as any mitigation measures required.

Aboriginal Community	Response/comments from the community	Response to Concern / Mitigation Proposed by Ernestown
Alderville First Nation	Alderville stated that it has no objections to the project which is located in the community's traditional territory and is entering into discussions with Ernestown Wind Park. (Refer to September 14, 2012 letter from Chief James Marsden)	No outstanding concerns or comments. No mitigation required. Consultation will be ongoing.
Curve Lake First Nation	Curve Lake First Nation Council is not currently not aware of any issues that would cause concern with respect to the community's Traditional, Aboriginal and Treaty rights. (Refer to the July 19, 2012 letter from Chief Phyllis Williams)	No outstanding concerns or comments. No mitigation required. Ernestown will continue to provide updates to the community.
Hiawatha First Nation	As per the Hiawatha First Nation Consultation Protocol, the project is deemed to have minimal potential to impact Hiawatha First Nations' right at this time.	No outstanding concerns or comments. No mitigation required. Ernestown will continue to provide updates to the community.
Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation	After careful review of the information provided, there are no areas of concern for Kawartha Nishnawbe First Nation. At this time, all concerns for the community have been met. (Refer to September 11, 2012 letter from Chief Kris Nahrgang)	No outstanding concerns or comments. No mitigation required. Ernestown will continue to provide updates to the community.
Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation	The community has no concerns or further comments regarding the Ernestown Wind Park as it has been presented to us to date. (Refer to September 14, 2012 letter from Murray Maracle)	No outstanding concerns or comments. No mitigation required. Ernestown will continue to provide updates to the community.
Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte	The Chief and Council of the Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte have entered into	No concerns or comments raised thus far. Consultation will be ongoing.

	<p>a consultation protocol with Ernestown Wind Park and will undertake the consultation in good faith.</p> <p>Community consultation commenced on September 18 and will conclude on September 27, 2012.</p> <p>(Refer to September 4, 2012 letter from Dan Brant)</p>	
<p>Métis Nation of Ontario, Northumberland Métis Council, and Seven Rivers Métis Council</p>	<p>Based on the information provided, the MNO and the regionally based Consultation Committee believe that should the project proceed there would be no immediate adverse impacts to Métis rights, culture, or way of life.</p> <p>(Refer to September 14, 2012 letter from James Wagar)</p>	<p>No outstanding concerns or comments. No mitigation required. Ernestown will continue to provide updates to the community.</p>

5.0 MUNICIPAL & AGENCY CONSULTATION

5.1 LOYALIST TOWNSHIP AND THE COUNTY OF LENNOX & ADDINGTON

Municipal consultation has been underway since 2010. There is an upper-tier and lower-tier Municipality in the region that the Project Location is within. The upper-tier Municipality is the County of Lennox and Addington, and the lower-tier Municipality is Loyalist Township. The two Municipalities have been collectively consulting on matters relating to transportation, traffic and utilities, which are reflected in the comments seem below in Table 21. Loyalist Township fielded all other matters concerning Municipal consultation.

TABLE 20: TIMELINE OF MUNICIPAL CONSULTATION

Agency	Date	Description
Loyalist Township	6/2/2010	Meeting with Township Planner to discuss the Project location and general issues and processes.
Loyalist Township	6/14/2010	Presentation to Council. Project information update.
City of Kingston	7/7/2010	Introduction letter.
Loyalist Township	7/7/2010	Introduction letter.
Loyalist Township	7/23/2010	Introduction letter.
Loyalist Township	8/25/2010	Meeting with Township Planner to discuss transportation routes /roads.
Loyalist Township	10/27/2010	Response included comments from the Township outlining natural heritage concerns in that area. That bird and bat studies be completed and made available to the public. The need for an emergency response plan acceptable to the Township's Fire Chief.
Loyalist Township	2/23/2011	Application for easement use of unmaintained road allowances.
Kingston & Area	5/4/2011	Introduction letter.
Loyalist Township	10/3/2011	Meeting with Township to provide a general update on the Project and to discuss community involvement.
Loyalist Township	10/14/2011	On site meeting to review locations for unopened road allowance usage with Surveyor, JS, and Ernestown Windpark Staff.

Loyalist Township	10/21/2011	Ernestown Windpark staff meet with Township's Planner to discuss project and use of road allowances.
Loyalist Township	12/1/2011	Ernestown met with Loyalist Township's Director of Engineering and their Planner to discuss use of unmaintained road allowances. Details of the development and the possibility of co-development were discussed.
Loyalist Township	12/12/2011	Presentation to Council. Project information update. Use of unopened road allowance.
Loyalist Township	2/6/2012	Ernestown applies for road allowance usage agreement with Loyalist.
Loyalist Township	3/12/2012	Ernestown is advised that council agrees in principle with its license applications for use of unmaintained road allowance and has instructed Loyalist staff to enter into negotiations with Ernestown. Resolution 2012.1.3.8 is adopted.
Loyalist Township	4/16/2012	Loyalist invites Ernestown to participate in the co-development of Jim Snow Dr. extension.
Loyalist Township	6/7/2012	Presentation to council. Project information update.
Loyalist Township	6/26/2012	Following a request from Ernestown on building permits, Loyalist Township provided information on applicable permits and costs.
Loyalist Township & Lennox and Addington	2012-06-29	Receipt of 90-Day Municipal Consultation Packages.
Loyalist Township	2/13/2012	Presentation to Council. Project information update. Use of unopened road allowance.
Lennox & Addington	2012-09-24	Received Municipal Consultation Form completed by Clerk Larry Keech of the County of Lennox & Addington.
Loyalist Township	2012-09-27	Received Municipal Consultation Form completed by Jim Sova, Municipal Planner of Loyalist Township.

Consultation with the Municipality of Loyalist Township and the County of Lennox & Addington has been underway since June 2010. Municipal comments to the following subject matters have been obtained:

1. Natural Heritage
2. Cultural Heritage/Built Heritage and Archaeology

3. Impact on existing municipal infrastructure
4. Emergency Response
5. Landscaping
6. Building Permit requirements

The Municipal Consultation Form was issued to Loyalist Township and the County of Lennox & Addington ninety days in advance of the final public meeting. The form and proof of transmittal can be found in Appendix C. A summary of the concerns raised by the Municipalities in the Municipal Consultation Form can be found below in Table 21. The Township was provided a formal response in writing for the concerns raised and consultation continues with the Township and its constituents.

TABLE 21: MUNICIPAL CONSULTATION FORM CONTENTS

Municipality	Area of Interest	Comment Summary	Response from Ernestown Windpark Inc.
Loyalist Township	Roadways	“Being that the County Roads are all built to a higher standard with dual layers of paved surface and heavy duty sub-surface my feeling is that we must ensure that the County Road system is used for the required haul routes. If need be signage and by-laws may be required to ensure that the preceding roads are not adversely effected.”	At the recommendation of the Municipality, Caton Road, Wind Road and Lucas Road are municipal roads deemed inappropriate for construction vehicles to use. The transportation plan maps County Roads 4 and 6, Millhaven Road and Taylor-Kidd Blvd. as the appropriate roads for construction traffic.
Loyalist Township	5.1 – Project Location	“The site does permit main access from County Roads more capable of handling the volumes and weights of trucks during the construction phase. The project may have some impact on drainage, but current plans appear to address those concerns. No municipal water or sewer services are available or proposed for the site.”	The construction schedule will be further refined as the project plans progress and appropriate consultations will take place with the Municipality to ensure that the half load restrictions are obeyed and overage applications are made as appropriate.
Loyalist Township	Storm water Management	“...the proposed interior roadway network must ensure that the natural runoff of storm water and spring thaw is not affected to the point that flooding occurs. My main concerns are the East West interior roads that are being created; these will require ditching and culverts in my mind in order to prevent the preceding from happening in the	Flood prevention is a critical objective of the road design being undertaken by an independent engineering firm.

		area of the proposed access road to Tower 4. The existing creek system flows from west to east for the most part south of the railway with the natural storm water/ spring thaw pattern flowing north and south mainly to Cooke's Creek."	
Loyalist Township	Entrance Details	"The Millhaven Road Proposed Entrance will require attention to detail in regard to culvert placement and size, as well additional ditching may be required along Millhaven Road to avoid possible flooding. Also locked gate will be required in order to prevent unnecessary entry."	Road design at the site entrances will be designed and constructed to mitigate all adverse effects such as, but not limited to: erosion, sedimentation, flooding and security.
Loyalist Township	Signage	"Temporary truck turning signage will be required as a minimum on both Taylor Kidd Blvd. and Millhaven Road and it is highly recommended that these sign be installed on 150mm x 150 mm pressure treated posts installed to a depth of no less than 900mm temporary shoulder signage will not suffice based on the probability of work being performed throughout the winter months. All other construction signage shall be per Book 7 of the highway traffic act."	Signage will be commissioned and maintained throughout the construction period.
Loyalist Township	Environmental Concerns – Silt Fencing	"Silt fences will be required in numerous locations to avoid contamination of the numerous creek and stream systems."	Silt fencing will be commissioned and maintained throughout the construction period.
Loyalist Township	Environmental Concerns – Flow Check Dams	"Flow check dams may be required in numerous locations."	Flow check dams will be commissioned and maintained throughout the construction period.
Loyalist Township	Environmental Concerns – Ditches and Culverts	"As previously mentioned drainage systems by means of ditching and culverts will require attention to detail in order not to disrupt the drainage patterns that already exist."	Sufficient ditches and culverts will be commissioned and maintained throughout the lifetime of the project.
Loyalist Township	Environmental Concerns – Water Crossing Permits	"Water crossings permits must be followed to the letter in order to avoid any impacts on wildlife or fauna."	Permit constraints and all other applicable regulations will be followed in the design and implementation of all water crossings.
Loyalist Township	Limiting traffic on new interior roads	"It is highly recommended that once the interior construction and maintenance roads be established that no traffic shall deviate from	In collaboration with the land owners, limited access to the project lands will be maintained throughout the construction and

		these routes this will avoid any unnecessary environmental impacts, crop damage and unnecessary rutting.”	operation of the facility.
Loyalist Township	Half-Load Limits	“...half load restrictions may apply between March 1 and April 30 and, that if oversized loads are contemplated, these will require review by the Township’s Transportation and Solid Waste Department.”	The construction schedule will be further refined as the project plans progress and appropriate consultations will take place with the Municipality to ensure that the half load restrictions are obeyed and overage applications are made as appropriate.
Loyalist Township	Construction working hours	“The proponent should be aware that Loyalist Township noise by-law 2011-6 applies and that it will only be allowed to undertake construction outside of the times noted in the by-law if a grant of exemption is given by the municipality. The noise by-law should be also referenced in the decommissioning report.”	Working hours will be in compliance with all applicable regulations.
Loyalist Township	Site Entrance Lighting	“The proponent has not indicated whether lighting will occur at the entrances to the site but if it is to be installed such fixtures should be full cutoff in order to respect the rural environment and nearby residents.”	Lighting, if installed at the site entrance, will be in compliance with all applicable regulations and will, as much as possible; be designed to limit the visual impact of the facility to neighboring rural residents.
Loyalist Township	5.2 Project Roads	“A traffic construction management plan has yet to be developed and the Township must be permitted to review such a document and be ensured it is finalized to the municipality’s satisfaction. This plan must also include pre and post assessments to the Township’s satisfaction for any Township road that will be utilized, and to restore the roads to their pre-construction condition.”	This document is in development with the Loyalist Township, the County of Lennox and Addington and Ernestown Windpark Inc. The document will be finalized and presented to the applicable councils for comment.
Loyalist Township	5.2 – Project Roads	“The current Traffic Management Plan identifies two possible main routes with additional options. A final Traffic Management Plan is required that identifies the routes chosen, both for the oversize deliveries as well as the aggregate and concrete deliveries.”	This document is in development with the Loyalist Township, the County of Lennox and Addington and Ernestown Windpark Inc. The document will be finalized and presented to the applicable councils for comment.

Loyalist Township	5.2 – Project Roads	“Significant detail is outstanding with respect to items including routes, signage, road improvements, traffic disruptions, oversize and overweight issues and pre and post construction inspection of roads.”	This document is in development with the Loyalist Township, the County of Lennox and Addington and Ernestown Windpark Inc. The document will be finalized and presented to the applicable councils for comment.
Loyalist Township	5.3 Municipal or Local Authority Service Connections	“The Township is concerned that drainage changes and water crossing structures not have a negative impact on any existing drainage within the project area”	Flood prevention is a critical objective of the road design being undertaken by an independent engineering firm. Sufficient ditches and culverts will be commissioned and maintained throughout the lifetime of the project.
Loyalist Township	Ground Water Taking	“... there is no discussion of the potential for the excavation for the foundations to impact the local groundwater table. In response to a question raised at the Open House on September 11, the proponent indicates that they will offer preconstruction water well testing.”	The construction of the foundations for each turbine is not expected to have any adverse effects on the water table. A full geotechnical report supporting this position will be provided to the Municipality in advance of construction.
Loyalist Township	Other By-laws	“In terms of applicable by-laws, besides the building and noise by-law, the proponent must adhere to the Township’s tree cutting, entrance permit, excavation, fill/site alteration, half loads, and fence by-laws.”	Ernestown Windpark Inc. will continue consultation with the Municipality to ensure that construction plans are within the regulations of all applicable by-laws.
County of Lennox & Addington	5.2 Project Roads	“An entrance permit must be obtained to authorize the construction of and entrance off of CR28 (Millhaven Road). “	Consultation will take place to develop the details of the entrance configuration with the County.
County of Lennox & Addington	5.2 Project Roads	“Roadway damage could occur due to the increased heavy truck traffic and heavy loads during construction. The County will require a pre-construction road condition survey and a post-construction survey to determine if any damage has occurred. The developer will be responsible to return the roads to their pre-construction condition. The tracking of mud/debris onto County roads could be an issue. Possible mitigation measures include ensuring there is adequate gravel on-site and or the construction of a mud mat on-	Ernestown Windpark Inc. understands and agrees to conduct a pre- and post-construction road survey to assess the state of the roads and make repairs as necessary to return them to pre-construction conditions. Additionally, it is understood that the contractor is responsible to limit all mud and debris tracked off the site onto County roads and is responsible for removal of any such debris that is deposited.

		site near the entrance. The contractor must be responsible for the prompt removal of any such debris from County roads.”	
County of Lennox & Addington	5.2 Project Roads	“The final Transportation Plan should confirm truck routing based on detailed route surveys that confirm clearances (both horizontal and vertical), and ensures adequate turning geometry exists on the intended routes. Truck speeds, noise, dust, safety, etc. should be addressed in the final Plan. Traffic control must be carried out in accordance with the latest edition of the Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) – Book 7 (Temporary Conditions) and any other applicable OTM’s.”	The revised and refined Transportation Plan is under development in collaboration with the County of Lennox & Addington, Loyalist Township and Ernestown Windpark Inc. The Plan will include clearances and delineate horizontal and vertical clearances, as well as details pertaining to vehicle speeds, noise, dust, safety, etc. All traffic control will be carried out in accordance with the latest edition of the Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) – Book 7 (Temporary Conditions) and any other applicable OTM’s.
County of Lennox & Addington	5.5 Project Construction	“Any loads that exceed the Highway Traffic Act loading regulations will require excess load permits from the County of Lennox & Addington, Loyalist Township, MTO, etc.”	Any instances in which load weights are anticipated to exceed the regulated weights, excess load permits will be obtained from the applicable jurisdictions and agencies.

5.2 AGENCY CONSULTATION

Notifications were provided to agency contacts throughout the REA planning process, as described in Section 1.3 and provided in Appendix C. In addition to project notifications, information requests were provided to various agencies.

TABLE 22: AGENCY CONSULTATION TIMELINE

Agency	Date (m/d/y)	Description
Amherst Radio	25/8/2010	No response.
Bell Mobility	23/2/2012 & 2/8/2012	No response.
Bombardier Transportation Canada Inc.	2/23/2012	No response.

Canadian Coast Guard - Communications systems and vessel traffic radar	02/24/2012 & 08/2/2012	No impact to Canadian Coast Guard communications in the vicinity of the Ernestown Wind Park.
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	7/16/2010	Advised to consult other agencies as required, provided web links for guidance, and stated that under the REA process, the Proponent is not legislated under the EA nor is the Proponent required to undertake an EA under the CEAA.
Canadian National Railway	09/2010 – 07/2012	Ernestown and CNR signed a crossing easement agreement for its electrical collector lines.
CBC	9/23/2010, 8/26/2010	Proponent to provide Project details as they become available, to identify the existence of communications towers within 5km of the Project, computation of a consultation zone (if any), and monitoring of signal quality prior to and after erecting the turbines. Proponent to advise local residents of the potential impact of wind turbines on radio and over-the-air television signals.
Christie Walthers Communications	8/9/2010	No response.
City of Kingston	8/24/2010	Provided a presentation to Council regarding the Project and draft project description on August 24, 2010.
Correctional Services Canada	8/4/2010	No concerns.
Department of Fisheries and Oceans	7/9/2010	Put into a queue - will get back to us.
DND - Radiocommunications Systems	2/23/2012 & 2/08/2012	Falls within consultation zone. Keep them updated with any changes. No impact with any presented layouts.
DND - Radar, Air Defense, ATC Airport and NAVAIDS	2/23/2012 & 8/2/2012	No concerns or objections at this time.

Environment Canada / Canadian Wildlife Service / Weather Service	2/24/2012 & 8/2/2012	No concerns at this time.
Hydro One Network Inc.	March 2011-Present	Grant of Easement across HydroOne corridor and Interconnection to electrical grid.
Kingston Airport	7/12/2010	No impact on airport operations. Outside of approach zones.
Kingston Police	8/3/2012 & 2/08/2012	Ernestown is OPP jurisdiction. Advised to contact Loyalist Emergency Services.
Loyalist Emergency Services	8/3/2012 & 8/2/2012	No real concerns with these types of operations. Would like to comment on location of access roads.
Ministry of Transportation Ontario	7/12/2010	No concerns. Ask that Proponent implement storm water management.
NAV Canada	7/9/2010 and 2/24/2012	Submit notice of construction form at least 10 days prior to construction. NAV Canada to perform assessment and advise.
Odessa Lion's Club	1/6/2012	Presentation to the Club providing details on the Project.
Ontario Provincial Police / Ministry of Government Services	8/3/2012 & 2/8/2012	No effect on their operations.
Parks Canada	7/23/2010	No concerns / comments.
RCMP	2/24/2012 & 2/08/2012	No response.
Rogers Wireless	7/12/2010 and 2/23/2012	No effect on their operations.
Telus Mobility	7/23/2010	Far from their operations - no effect.
Trans-Northern Pipeline	5/14/2011	Turbine locations not a concern. Advised of 30m pipeline easement and process for crossing if necessary. Late changes to site plan may require a crossing easement / agreement with Trans-Northern.

Transport Canada / Aerodromes and Air Navigation	7/14/2010	Concurrent consultation with NAV Canada and Transport Canada. Initial assessment required lighting two turbines. No requirement for painting. No requirement to advise prior to construction.
Union Gas	12/21/2010	No concerns. Provided information on pipelines in the area and directed Proponent to Ontario1Call for locates prior to construction.
Utilities Kingston	3/23/2012	Offered to provide data link services. No effect on operations.

6.0 CHANGES MADE BASED ON CONSULTATIONS

A number of revisions, changes and additions have been made to the project design based on input from the public, Aboriginal communities, the Municipality and Agencies. These changes have been made throughout the development of the project and were incorporated into the final REA report submission. Key changes to the project are listed below.

1. Well water testing
2. Removal of wetland water crossings
3. Shadow Flicker Study for concerned land owners
4. Turbine lighting beacons

The draft documents were amended after the Sept. 18th, 2012 Public Meeting, prior to submittal of the REA Application. Amendments were undertaken to clarify content, ensure consistency amongst reports, respond to comments from the consultation process, correct errors and reflect the current state of Project planning and regulations. A summary of the non-editorial amendments made to the draft REA reports, and the reason for the amendment, are provided in Table 13, below.

There were no changes made to the Proposal to Engage as a result of all consultation activities and information provided from external sources during consultation.

TABLE 23: SUMMARY REA REPORT AMENDMENTS

Amendment	Reason	REA Report Reference
Jim Snow Drive extension to be built in conjunction with the Municipality as access road to the southern half of the site	Proponent came to an agreement with the Loyalist Township Planner to suit the Township and reduce impact to the businesses to the east of the proposed road	Project Description Report, Design and Operations Report, and Construction Report
Well Water Testing for concerned residents	Concerns were raised in consultation with the public and the proponent has agreed to test wells pre-construction and monitor post-construction for any impacts	Design and Operations Report, and Construction Report
Additional Visual Impact Studies	Concerns were raised in consultation with the public and the proponent has agreed to test additional vantage points from specific residents who expressed concern	Visual Impact Study

Additional Noise Impact Assessments	Concerns were raised in consultation with the public and the proponent has agreed to test additional receptor points from specific residents who expressed concern	Noise Impact Assessment
-------------------------------------	--	-------------------------

7.0 OUTSTANDING ITEMS

There are a small number of outstanding items remain, listed below. These items will be addressed appropriately after the final REA submission and before or after construction of the Ernestown Wind Park.

1. Testing of water wells to determine potential impacts from excavation
2. Replanting of cleared project location trees (post-commissioning)
3. Conducting a detailed telecommunications impact study for consultation with CBC

APPENDIX A: PUBLIC CONSULTATION MATERIALS

- A1. Proof that, in a form approved by the Director, a notice of the proposal to engage in a renewable energy project was distributed at least 30 days before the first public meeting was held;
- A2. In a form approved by the Director, notices of the location and time of at least two public meetings to be held for the purpose of conducting consultations in respect of the renewable energy project were distributed at least 30 days before the first public meeting was held;
- A3. Proof that public meeting notices were published on at least two separate days in a newspaper with general circulation in each local municipality in which the project location is situated;
- A4. Proof that the public meeting notices were posted on the project website;
- A5. Proof that a copy of the notices were sent to every assessed land owner within 550m of the project location;
- A6. Proof that the draft Project Description Report is posted on the website before the first public meeting and remains posted until after the Director makes a decision under section 47.5 of the Act;
- A7. Proof that, at least 60 days before the final public meeting, the Draft REA reports were made available to the public on the project website;
- A8. Proof that, at least 60 days before the final public meeting, the Draft REA reports were made available to the public in hard copy at a location within the municipality in which the project is situated;
- A9. Supporting documentation from Public Meetings including Surveys and Question Sheets, posters, and the Visual Impact Study used during Public and Aboriginal consultation; and
- A10. Letters and Postcards of Support, Petition of Support for the Ernestown Wind Park.

APPENDIX B: ABORIGINAL CONSULTATION MATERIALS

B1. Evidence that the information required to be distributed to Aboriginal communities under O.Reg. 359/09 s. 17 (1) was distributed;

B2. Any Information provided by an Aboriginal community in response to a request made under paragraph 4 of O.Reg. 359/09 s. 17 (1);

B3. Proof that every Aboriginal community on the list obtained in section 14 and any other Aboriginal community that, in the opinion of the proponent, has or may have constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty rights that could be adversely impacted by the renewable energy project or otherwise be interested in any negative environmental effects of the project, has received the notices;

B4. A copy of the draft Project Description Report which was distributed to Aboriginal communities;

B5. Proof that a written request was made that the Aboriginal communities provide, in writing, any information available to the community that, in its opinion, should be considered in preparing a document summarized under paragraph 3, and in particular, any information the community may have about the adverse impacts that the project may have on constitutionally protected Aboriginal or treaty rights and any measures for mitigating those adverse impacts; and

B6. Proof that, at least 60 days before the final public meeting, the Draft REA reports were made available to Aboriginal communities for Chief and Council viewing.

B7. REA Report Summaries sent to Aboriginal communities on June 27th, 2012.

APPENDIX C: MUNICIPAL CONSULTATION MATERIALS

- C1. Evidence that a consultation form was distributed to the Municipality, in accordance with subsection O.Reg. 359/09 s. 18 (1);
- C2. The Consultation Form distributed under subsection 18 (1), if any part of it has been completed by a municipality, local roads board or local services board;
- C3. Proof that the clerk of each local municipality and upper-tier municipality in which the project is situated has received the notices and proof that the secretary-treasurer of each local roads board has received the notices (Note: In the Lennox and Addington County, the same elected official, Larry Keech, identified himself as the sole recipient for the clerk and the roads board). Proof that the secretary-treasurer of the planning board which has jurisdiction in which the project is located has received the notices (Note that Murray Beckel identified himself as the sole recipient in place of the clerk and the planning board in the Loyalist Township);
- C4. Proof that the Director has received the notices;
- C5. Proof that the Ministry of the Environment's district manager in the district that the project is situated has received the notices; and
- C6. Municipal consultation involving regular information updates and assessment of permitting requirements.

APPENDIX D: CONSULTATION WITH AGENCIES

D1. Proof that the proponent provided the Director with a draft of the Project Description Report to obtain a list of Aboriginal communities

D2. Federal Agencies

D3. Provincial Agencies

D4. Telecommunications and Radio Agencies

D5. Emergency Services

D6. Other Agencies